

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

It was well that the results of the documentary analysis of the historical books of the Old Testament were in a measure popularized before the results of similar work done on the Gospels. Members of the reading public who are interested in such matters thus had the opportunity of becoming familiar with the idea that books long regarded as sacrosanct were composites of earlier documents which the critical process can reveal with more or less accuracy; of learning too, that while we have to part with the element of superstition in the reverence in which we held our sacred books, the work of analysis has robbed them of none of their moral and religious power.

One difficulty the layman has with the whole theory lies in the difference between the licence claimed by and allowed to the ancient, and even the mediæval, historian in the handling of his materials, and the conventions by which the modern historian is bound. A writer to-day, when he quotes verbatim, is expected to make clear by quotation marks that he is doing so, and to acknowledge the source of his indebtedness. He is, moreover, required to attach primary importance to accuracy of fact.

But until comparatively recently historians with few exceptions considered themselves at liberty, not only to embody in their own writings un-

acknowledged extracts from previous writings, but to compress or even alter these at will. This change in the ethical code of writers is to be ascribed in part to the modern origin of the conception of property in the product of one's brain, partly to the absence in ancient times of those mechanical devices, such as inverted commas and footnotes, by which we now indicate that we are using borrowed material.

Further, the Jewish historian regards himself as an interpreter rather than simply a recorder of life. To him history is the handwriting of God. He writes history in such a way as to bring out what he believes to be the moral. He is a preacher rather than a scientific historian; and, what is even more puzzling to us, he sometimes claims the right not only to select the facts, but even to alter them in the interests of his message. In vindication of this statement we have only to point to the Book of Chronicles.

In this case the facts speak for themselves; but when the student of the Old Testament claims that the historical books can be analysed into earlier documents, he is met with the apparent difficulty that those earlier documents no longer exist in any independent form. Have we any proof that history was ever actually written in this 'scissors and paste' method?

At this point the analytical study of the Gospels sheds light on the composition of the historical books of the Old Testament. Books like Peake's 'Commentary on the Bible' have familiarized general readers with the outstanding results of the critical analysis of the Synoptic Gospels; and in the new edition of the Century Bible an attempt was made to indicate, in the text of the Synoptic Gospels, the source (in document or tradition) of each section, on a plan with which we have been long familiar in the Old Testament.

It is pretty generally agreed now that in the second Gospel we have one of the documents used by the authors of the first and third Gospels. By reading in a good Synopsis we can see for ourselves the way in which they wrought it into their own narratives, transcribing, summarizing, omitting, altering, adding, or improving as the case may be. The real problem is not why nearly all the source documents of both Testaments have perished, but why 'Mark' survived when practically the whole of it is embodied either in 'Matthew' or in 'Luke' or in both.

Presumably the explanation is that Mark's Gospel was known and revered in some important local Church before 'Matthew' and 'Luke' arrived as rivals; and it was then too firmly entrenched to be dislodged, in spite of its insufficiency as an account of the life and teaching of Jesus. What Church more probable than the Church of Rome? Irenæus suggests, if he does not actually say, that Mark wrote at Rome. Clement of Alexandria (c. 200) does say so. In 2 Ti 4¹¹ Mark is summoned to Rome by the Apostle. 1 Peter also seems to associate Mark and Peter in Rome (5¹³); nor is the fact of this association dependent on the Petrine authorship of the Epistle.

In another well-known case we can see the gospel historian actually at work. If 'Matthew' and 'Luke' each combined 'Mark' and other sources into a new Gospel, why should not some one have combined our four Gospels into a fifth? This was

actually done, some time in the second half of the second century, by Tatian, the converted strolling rhetorician, presumably for the benefit of the 'order' he had founded. We have not the original of this 'Diatessaron,' as it is called; but we have various translations, and can see the principles on which he pieced together extracts from the four Gospels to make a connected story. For centuries this single composite Gospel, the 'Diatessaron,' seems to have been the only form in which the Gospel was publicly read in the Syriac speaking Churches.

In the latest study of the subject (*The Four Gospels*), noticed in another column, Canon STREETER makes telling use of a literary experience of his own. As is well known, he and Mr. A. J. Appaswamy three or four years ago jointly prepared for publication a sketch of the personality and the teaching of the Indian Christian Sadhu, Sundar Singh. The materials at the disposal of the authors consisted partly of documents in print and in manuscript, partly of recollections of the Sadhu, their own and those of others. The documentary material consisted of two lives of the Sadhu and various reports of his utterances, in particular three collections of his addresses.

Both in the purely historical matter and in the reported sayings of the Sadhu there was much overlapping, yet the authors had to produce a connected story. They used their judgment in making omissions rendered necessary by space limitations or similar considerations, grouping the sayings under appropriate headings, selecting the most interesting or most authentic version of a story when there were parallels, though sometimes 'conflating' two or more versions, and in correcting the Sadhu's imperfect English when necessary. Those who know even the elements of the study of the Synoptic Problem will realize the striking similarity between this editing process and that ascribed to the authors of the first and third Gospels. The illustration is all the more enlightening because it was only when the book was in proof that Canon

STREETER saw the significance of the close parallels between the methods of the ancient and the modern authors in carrying through their similar tasks.

Granted, then, that the first and third Gospels, and perhaps in a less degree the second, are composite structures, how does this affect our estimate of their credibility? It is not so long since New Testament students spoke of the 'triple tradition,' and assumed that a story told in each of the first three Gospels had all the reliability of a threefold cord. But when the structure of these three Gospels was better understood, and it was realized that for much of their material 'Matthew' and Luke were dependent on Mark, it became clear that repetition by 'Matthew' and Luke added nothing to the trustworthiness of a story told by Mark.

Analysis, however, also disclosed that the authors of the first and third Gospels certainly, and Mark probably, had used also a collection (probably written) of sayings of Jesus, in which may have been included a certain amount of 'incident.' Thus instead of a triple tradition we now had a double tradition; and for some considerable time this hypothesis has held the field. Scholars, indeed, have tended to think that there was some curious advantage in trying to restrict to two the number of sources used by 'Matthew' and 'Luke'; just as they have underestimated the probability that the same saying of Jesus would be current in various independent forms in different documents or traditions.

The fact that hardly any of the parables seems to have been in the 'Sayings' source should have given them pause. The Good Samaritan, the Prodigal Son, the Pharisee and the Taxgatherer are found only in Luke, the Labourers in the Vineyard and the Pearl of Great Price only in 'Matthew.' We have been slow to draw from such facts the natural conclusion, not that the 'Sayings' source is of secondary importance, but that other sources used in the composition of the first and third Gospels are of the first importance.

In addition, then, to 'Mark' and 'Q' (as the 'Sayings' source is commonly called), 'Matthew' had his special source and 'Luke' had his; so that what we now have is a Four Document hypothesis, each of the four source documents playing its distinctive part in giving us that picture of Jesus which we get from the Synoptic Gospels.

Readers of the *Hibbert Journal* are already aware in some measure of the direction which Canon STREETER's studies have been taking with regard to Luke's Gospel. We have commonly assumed that Luke like Matthew used Mark as the basis of his Gospel, and inserted his other material at what seemed to him the appropriate place in the narrative. Thus Luke 9⁵¹-18¹⁴ has been called Luke's 'Great Interpolation.' Canon STREETER's thesis is that Luke had already written his Gospel in a shorter form, a first edition if you will, or 'Proto-Luke,' before he saw Mark's Gospel.

If Luke was the author of the 'We' sections in Acts, he had plenty of opportunity of getting authentic information about Jesus. In particular, he had stayed two years in Cæsarea and had been the guest of Philip the evangelist of Samaria. Combining knowledge of Jesus there acquired with a study of the 'Sayings' document, Luke wrote a Gospel the beginning of which survives in chapter 3 of our Luke, the opening verses of which read like the introduction to a book. Readers of this Gospel have been puzzled to know why the genealogy of Jesus is put, not among the infancy stories, but at the end of chapter 3. On Canon STREETER's theory the explanation is simple. The genealogy is given after the first mention of Jesus.

Later in life, so the theory runs, Luke came across a copy of Mark, and added copious extracts from it, along with the Infancy stories which he had now heard, to his earlier Gospel to form 'Luke' as we know it. On this theory 'Mark' was only a secondary source for Luke. Whether Canon STREETER is right or not, he makes out an excellent case for a very interesting theory.

It seems at last to be becoming clear that the Synoptic tradition of Jesus is based on a far broader foundation than we had supposed. In particular, we are beginning to realize that Luke's marvellous special contribution to our knowledge of Jesus is not, as perhaps we had been accustomed to think it, a tributary to the main stream. It is one of four principal lines of tradition, surely not the least understanding of the four. We can never be sufficiently grateful that it has preserved for us the two greatest stories ever told.

Welcome light is shed on the first Gospel also, though from a different side. Some of the most puzzling sayings in the Gospels occur only in 'Matthew.' 'Till heaven and earth pass, no dot of an "i" or stroke of a "t" shall pass till all be fulfilled.' 'Do not go into any road that leads to Gentile territory, and do not enter a Samaritan city.' 'I was not sent except to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.' All of these sayings seem to come from 'Matthew's' special source, which reflects in places a strong Jewish-Christian sentiment. May it be that some of these 'hard sayings,' at least in the form in which we have them, reflect not so much the mind of Jesus as misconceptions of His mind that passed current in the period of heated controversy on the relation of Gentile Christians to the Church?

'The Humanism of the Bible' series, edited by Professor J. E. McFadyen and Professor D. Russell Scott, is brought to an end by the volume entitled *Through Eternal Spirit* (James Clarke; 6s. net), which deals with the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of James, and 1 Peter, and is written by Professor Joseph F. McFADYEN, D.D., of Kingston. The aim of the series, as defined by the editors, is 'to set forth the human experience that underlies and is reflected in the Bible,' 'to help the readers of the Bible to feel that its writers were bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, men who knew perplexity and sorrow, and were well acquainted with our doubts and fears and grief,' 'to indicate the

permanent human interest and worth' of the Biblical books. This aim has been admirably achieved by the latest volume.

The writer's task was not an easy one. James has his baffling passages, but on the whole his moralistic message is readily intelligible to our practical age. The case is very different, however, with the Epistle to the Hebrews. Few books could at first sight seem more remote from the modern man. Steeped in the phraseology of ancient ritual, and conducting its appeal to the Old Testament by arguments of which the modern exegete can seldom approve, it is little calculated to attract the interest of a generation like ours. It is the merit of Professor MCFADYEN to have shown that, apart from the rolling eloquence which has always fascinated those who have ears to hear, the book has a profound meaning and message for our own generation.

The questions with which the writer deals, Dr. MCFADYEN points out, are the very questions which thrust themselves so insistently upon our own age. One of those questions is the finality of the Christian religion. 'Hebrews' discusses it against the background of Judaism; we have to discuss it against a background of other religions and -isms of many kinds; and, as the writer of the Epistle has shown that Jesus 'has actually done the one thing that men needed to have done,' so in the face of any projected new religion we are entitled to ask, 'What could a new revelation do for us that Jesus has not done?'

The background of the Epistle is also curiously modern, in that it was addressed to men who, like many of us to-day, had 'in large measure lost the enthusiasm of their first love,' and had been tempted to neglect or forsake the Christian gatherings. And there are some in our day who are attracted by apocalyptic expectations which 'offer to bring to a close the long, weary struggle that seems to count for nothing.' To them, too, the writer has something to say about the real nature

of the promised rest which they so little understand. So the Epistle is not so remote after all.

But it has an intellectual as well as a religious appositeness. Commenting on the warning in 2¹ that his readers are not to drift away from their moorings, Dr. MCFADYEN happily remarks, 'Men who are afraid of new ideas cannot appeal for support to the author of this Epistle. What they mean is that the Christian mind should remain stationary while the stream of thought flows by. His meaning is that the Christian soul should remain anchored while the stream of temptation flows by.' And again, on 5¹²⁻¹⁴, 'those who plead for the perpetual preaching of the "simple Gospel" get no support from this Christian teacher. To him the constant preaching of elementary truth leads to intellectual laziness, which in turn issues in spiritual and moral sluggishness.'

One of the most attractive features of this exposition of the Epistle is that it is written by a teacher who has had long experience as a missionary. Perhaps it is not too much to say that early Christian literature will never be completely understood by those who forget its missionary implications, and the missionary has a special right to be heard in the interpretation of it. Dealing with the argument that an Epistle so reminiscent of the Old Testament could not possibly have been addressed to Gentile Christians, he reminds us that 'modern missionary experience makes it abundantly clear that converts from the world religions readily learn to regard the Old Testament as one of their sacred books, and to give it a reverence at least as great as that which they had for the Scriptures of their former religion.'

Here, as elsewhere throughout the New Testament, he reminds us, we are in the atmosphere of a mission Church, whose members are surrounded by non-Christians, continually on the watch; and he illustrates the solemn words in 6⁸⁻⁹ about relapse by his own experience of the conduct of a convert from Hinduism who had renounced his profession

of the Christian faith. Again, in his discussion of James, he comes back to this point. Speaking on 2¹⁻⁹ of the caste distinctions resting on difference of financial status, he remarks, 'Perhaps nothing in the life of the Christian Church in India impresses the Hindu quite so much as the sight of converts from the "untouchable" classes received in the Church on absolutely equal terms with Brahmin converts, even if with less éclat.'

One of the freshest features of the discussion is the view that the writer of the Epistle, despite his superabundant sacerdotal phraseology, is really a prophet rather than a priest at heart. The Christianity which it reflects is of a 'peculiarly unecclesiastical and non-sacerdotal type,' and the writer sympathizes 'with the prophetic depreciation rather than with the priestly exaltation of sacrifice and ritual. For the priests he has not a good word to say.'

From the argument of the Epistle, Dr. MCFADYEN draws the courageous conclusion that the only real priest is the priest after the order of Melchizedek, 'whose worth lies in himself, not in his ancestry nor in anything adventitious.' 'The high-priesthood of Jesus is so described that for one who has followed and accepted the argument, it is unthinkable that there can be a human priest in the Christian Church.' A human Christian priest is a contradiction in terms. "'Teachers" and "leaders" we have, and need; but the priest who professes to represent us before God, or to mediate God's forgiveness to us, is trying to undo what Jesus did so effectively once for all.' 'Apostolical succession is not from hand to hand, but from spirit to spirit.'

The book is written with a fine appreciation of the profound spiritual power of the Epistle—its power to lift its readers from the shadow to the substance, from time to eternity, from the world that passes to the world of timeless, unseen realities. And it is lit by many a scintillating epigram which reminds us of the writer's earlier book on 'Jesus

and Life.' One of his comments on Ja 2¹⁴⁻²⁶, e.g.—the passage where the contrast is drawn between faith and works—runs thus: 'James has only one test of orthodoxy, usually about the last test the Church has thought of applying: What kind of character does it produce?' Wholesome doctrine this: and the book which recalls us to these fundamental things, and which succeeds in making the great Epistle to the Hebrews speak with its ancient power to the men of our own generation, is a book to be welcomed by all who would understand the Bible and the deep things of Christian experience.

A generation ago there was a well-known writer of religious stories for girls, who was fond of telling her readers that So-and-so was the owner of the largest dry goods store in New York, and yet he was always found in his place in church on Sunday; that So-and-so was the best-dressed girl in Boston, and yet she conducted a Bible class for down-town girls; and that some one else was the most highly-paid lawyer in Philadelphia, and yet he never missed the weekly prayer-meeting of his Church. This point of view may impress those it is meant to impress; but there are very few of us, however well we may be dressed, or however large our shops or our incomes, that shed an added lustre on Christianity when we become its patrons.

Have the editors of the 'Modern Churchman's Library' not laid themselves the least bit open, however unintentionally and unconsciously, to the charge of encouraging the same point of view, in their advertisement of the aim of the series? 'An effort to meet the need for clear, short, truthful books dealing with the Christian Religion from the standpoint of those who, while accepting the main results of modern scientific, historical, and literary research, are yet believers in the Christian Religion and working members of the Church of England.' Perhaps it is chiefly a matter of phraseology; but the idea that there is something portentous in an educated man accepting the Christian creed is one which it is possible to treat with too much respect,

The seventh volume of the series is *Reminiscences of Jesus by an Eye-witness*, by the Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D. (Murray; 3s. 6d. net). The Principal of Ripon Hall is well known as a New Testament student and editor of 'The Modern Churchman.' The readers he has in view belong to that wide class of educated men who have a vague impression that the Bible has been proved to be historically unreliable, and who, in consequence, believe that, as an historical religion, Christianity rests on a foundation of sand.

Dr. MAJOR confines himself to one aspect of this question, but that by far the most important aspect: the trustworthiness of our knowledge of the facts of Jesus' life. The book resolves itself in part into a study of the Synoptic problem, to which indeed it will serve as an excellent introduction. The teacher who does not read his Gospels in a synopsis is depriving himself of a study of engrossing interest, and losing one of the most effective means of learning to see in Jesus what the different original traditions and Gospel writers saw in Him.

One who thus studies the Gospels in parallel columns soon becomes convinced of one thing: that the Second Gospel was written before the others. Of this there are many proofs which are well summarized by Dr. MAJOR. To say nothing of the many passages in which Matthew and Luke are obviously correcting or improving Mark, there is in Mark less appeal to Messianic prophecy; the Christology is more primitive; the healing ministry is, comparatively speaking, incidental; and miracle plays a much less important part in the story. With reference to this last point, Dr. MAJOR notes that the word *σημεῖον* (sign), used in the Fourth Gospel as a significant term for the miracles of Jesus, as applied to miracles has in Mark somewhat sinister associations.

A single illustration may be given of the way in which a synoptic study of the Gospels helps to clear up difficulties. Many have been puzzled by

the curious distinction drawn in Matthew and Luke between blasphemy against the Son of Man and blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, the former being a venial, the latter a mortal sin. The parallel passage in Mark (3²⁸) reads: 'Verily I tell you that everything shall be forgiven to *the sons of men*, their sins and the blasphemies with which they blaspheme.' It certainly looks as if at a later stage 'the sons of men' has somehow become confused with 'the Son of Man.' Usually, however, the alterations made by Matthew and Luke are more obvious, if not always more important.

It is, then, a point in favour of Mark's Gospel that it is earlier than the others, and therefore nearer in time to the events it records. Yet priority alone does not prove reliability. Is there anything to suggest that Mark's Gospel was trusted by those who were in a position to judge? For one thing it seems clear that the authors of the first and third Gospels made use of the second; in fact, by the use of a synopsis any reader can satisfy himself that between them they embody practically the whole of Mark's Gospel. Obviously, then, these men regarded Mark as an authority of the first rank, and from Luke's preface we know that he at least examined his sources with something of the outlook of a modern historian.

Further, as Canon Streeter has shown, it was a testimony to the esteem in which Mark was held that it was preserved at all. The primitive document in which many scholars believe the Sayings of Jesus were recorded perished when these Sayings secured their place in Matthew and in Luke; the document was apparently then regarded as superfluous. The second Gospel, though, so to speak, swallowed up in the first and third, survived; doubtless because of the esteem in which it was held, perhaps by the Church of Rome.

There are indications, not only that Mark's Gospel is the earliest of the four, and that from the beginning it held an honoured place in one or more of the great Church centres, but also that

it contains the reminiscences of an eye-witness. Dr. MAJOR thus happily characterizes the four Gospels: 'In Matthew we see the Christian scribe at work; in Luke we see the Christian man of letters, the literary artist, at work; in John we have the creations of the Christian mystic, and, one must add also, the Christian dramatist and controversialist; but in Mark we have the reminiscences of the plain man who heard the winged words uttered by Jesus Himself and saw them transfix the hearts of men.'

Although Mark's Gospel is much the shortest of the four, its brevity is not due to any pruning of the language, but largely to the comparative paucity of the materials he uses. Speaking generally, where there are parallel accounts of the same incident, Mark tells it at greater length. We get from him such details as a story-teller inserts for no other reason than that he remembers the thing happened so.

Thus in the story of the call of James and John it is Mark alone who notes the presence of the hired servants with Zebedee; it is he alone who tells us that in the house where the paralytic was healed 'there was no room, no, *not even about the door*'; and that on the sea of Galilee 'other boats were with him,' and that 'he was *in the stern, sleeping on the cushion*.'

As it happens, we know who this eye-witness was; for a tradition that is as old as Papias, and goes back to the second quarter of the second century, regards Mark as the 'interpreter' of Peter; and there seems no reason to doubt the belief of the early Church that in the second Gospel we have, possibly among other elements, the story of Jesus as Peter was wont to tell it.

One question, however, naturally presents itself. Is the picture of Peter in Mark's Gospel such as we should expect to find if Peter is here drawing his own portrait? In some respects it certainly is. Mark tells us how Peter, with James and John, was chosen for special honour in the house of

Jairus, on the Mount of Transfiguration, and in Gethsemane, and that Peter was the first of the Twelve to find in Jesus the Messiah.

Yet the Peter of Mark's Gospel is not always the Peter of the innermost circle of the Twelve. When Peter had discovered the Messianic secret, he 'took Jesus and began to rebuke him,' which to the generation into which the written Gospels came must have seemed almost like sacrilege; again, in Mark, followed by Matthew, we have the 'get thee behind me, Satan.' It is 'Matthew' and not Mark who gives us 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build my church'; nor is there any glossing over of 'Though I must die with thee, I will not deny thee,' nor of the threefold denial that followed it. Do these things suggest that the tradition did not come from Peter? Only those can believe it who have failed to understand the honest, humble, impulsive disciple, telling for his own good and the good of his hearers what a dullard and coward he had been, wondering without ceasing at the love that had never despaired, not even of a Peter.

Nor is it only the story of Peter that is impartially told. In some respects Mark has allowed us to see Jesus Himself more clearly than to the reverential homage of Matthew and Luke seemed quite fitting. A typical example is the way in which the three evangelists record what happened after the baptism of Jesus. Mark says quite frankly that 'immediately the spirit drives him into the desert.' In Matthew, 'Jesus was led into the desert by the spirit.' In Luke, Jesus, apparently voluntarily, 'withdrew from the Jordan, and was led in the desert under the influence of the spirit.'

One more point. In a well-known fragment, preserved by Eusebius, Papias asserts that when Mark wrote down Peter's reminiscences, he did not narrate them 'in order.' It is true that Mark's chronological scheme is not very obvious, that much of his material is undated, and that his arrangement is sometimes topical rather than temporal. All the more important is the fact brought out by Dr.

MAJOR, that a clear sequence of events can be detected, that, in fact, it is from Mark we get what is practically our sole reliable clue to the order of events in Jesus' ministry.

There is in the first place a progressive unveiling of the Messiahship: first, to Jesus Himself at His baptism; then to the insane and demoniacs; after that, to Peter and the Twelve. In the next stage we see Jesus attempting to teach the disciples the true meaning of Messiahship, part of the instruction being given in the Transfiguration, and in Jesus' use of the title 'Son of Man.' At the entry to Jerusalem, the Messiahship is publicly announced, and at the last it is explicitly declared by Jesus to the high priest and to Pilate.

Along with this development of the revelation of the Messianic secret, there is a gradual evolution of Jesus' teaching methods. The synagogue ministry gives place to parabolic teaching, which in turn is followed by the pastoral training of the disciple circle, the last stage of which is the exposition of the meaning of the Passion. Do we not feel in both cases that this is how things actually happened, and that the story comes to us, not from an historian, but from one who is telling what he remembered?

While Dr. MAJOR follows critical methods, he never blindly accepts supposed results of criticism. He rejects the common idea that the story of the 'cursing' of the fig tree is a confused version of what appears in Luke's Gospel as the parable of the barren fig tree. As for the feeding of the five thousand, 'We have no adequate explanation of it on non-miraculous lines: there have been many attempts of this sort, but the narrative does not lend itself to rationalization at present. We seem compelled to accept the historical fact, and are equally compelled to wait for its explanation.'

In connexion with this timely piece of work one word of caution seems necessary. Dr. MAJOR must not be understood as suggesting that it is only in Mark's Gospel we have authentic information about

Jesus. In 'The Four Gospels,' Canon Streeter has shown that in the Gospels we can trace several sources. In some of these, as, for example, in the 'Sayings' document or tradition and in Luke's special source, we can feel as sure as we do even in reading Mark's Gospel that we are in contact with the real Jesus.

In the remarkably able study of St. Paul by the Rev. C. T. WOOD, B.D., the Dean of Queens' College, Cambridge—*The Life, Letters and Religion of St. Paul* (reviewed elsewhere)—there is a concluding chapter which contains a summary of St. Paul's religious belief. Mr. Wood tells us that the motive he had in writing his book was to study St. Paul's religion, and he lays down two conditions on which alone a real knowledge of this can be gained. One is as complete a renunciation as possible of all preconceptions, and the other as complete as possible a knowledge of Paul's life and environment. It is the barest justice to say that Mr. Wood fulfils these requirements in an eminent degree. His book is founded on the fullest knowledge, and it is stamped all over with sincerity.

Mr. Wood knows all about the mystery religions and the Greek world of thought and Pharisaic theology, and allows for them all so far as they influenced Paul; but he is quite clear in his conviction that Paul's religious belief was based in all its elements on his experience of Christ. He had inherited from his Jewish faith the belief in the one transcendent God, and his great problem was to discover how any mortal man can be at home with this supremely holy Being? It was Christ who solved this problem for him, for it was through the self-sacrificing love of God which he discovered in Christ that sinful man is lifted up, redeemed, forgiven, accepted. Utterly free redemption is available for any man who can answer to God's self-stooping love.

And this redemption is found in union with the Risen Lord. This union with the ever-present

Christ is the pivot of Paul's religion, and therefore of his theology. His constant refrain is 'in Christ.' He uses a great many metaphors to express this, like redemption and salvation, but we must not press these metaphors or make a theology out of them (as, for example, when men infer that there was some mysterious transaction between God the Father and Christ). However Paul expresses it, the central truth of his religion, as it was of his life, was the presence of Christ as his comrade. Paul was in Christ as any one of us is 'in' a friend with whom we are bound by close ties of affection and trust.

It is quite clear that the doctrine of 'imputed' righteousness is not to be found in Paul—that is to say, the idea that God is a lawgiver who attaches a penalty to any breach of His law and demands that the majesty of that law shall be vindicated, as it was by the obedience of Christ. This theory brings satisfaction to some people, but we search for it in vain in the letters of Paul. God showed His absolute righteousness by proving to men that He the all-Holy cannot forgive sin without an incalculable cost *to Himself, paid by Himself*, of yearning suffering over His children. So God always suffers for the sins of the world; and the price proves His utter holiness as well as the infinity of His redemptive love.

So much for Paul's theology proper. A second outstanding fact in Paul's religious belief is the relation of the individual to the Church. Christ or 'the Spirit of Christ,' or 'the Spirit of God' (for he uses the three terms interchangeably, Ro 8^{9, 10}), is ever present with the Christian to guide him into truth. But is this guidance granted primarily to the individual or the Church as a whole? Paul would unquestionably say, 'to the Church through the individuals of whom it is composed.' Yet the life of the whole body is much richer than the life of any member of it. And catholicity implies the gathering into one of every man's gift and revelation. It is inclusive, not exclusive.

It is in this connexion we have the Sacraments.

Paul's attitude to these is very much the same as that of the Jewish prophets to sacrifice; they are only of help to those who come with a humble and sincere heart. Jesus, who discarded all the elaborate ritual of the Jews, seems deliberately to have based these two Christian symbols on the commonest acts of daily life—washing and feeding; but to the early Christians the prime significance of each sacrament resided in the fact that the Lord is actually present. Does the sacrament effect what it symbolizes for those who come conscious of His presence? As much perhaps as a mother kissing her child as a sign and symbol of affection feeds its love for her. The very simplicity of these sacraments, indeed, is a proof that we are meant to raise all the common acts of life to their level and potentiality. All things uncontaminated by sin are God's sacraments to man. There is nothing more than this in Paul's view of the Sacraments.

The final point in Paul's religious belief is his eschatology. Here he showed his originality, for while much of the eschatology of the early Church

was still confined to the swaddling clothes of Jewish belief, he came to the great conclusion that to die means to go and be with Christ immediately, and he formulated the great conception of the spiritual body. The Christian would enjoy eternal life because he was 'in Christ' and had received God's life into himself. As to the fate of the wicked, the early Christians had no more knowledge than we have. There would be a hell, but whether that would be retributive and everlasting or redemptive and temporary, they had no clear opinion. Paul, however, came in the end to the great hope of the ultimate redemption of all mankind.

Paul's message to our own age may be said to be this above all, the reality of a religious experience based on fellowship with Christ. The attempt to discredit this as the fruit of auto-suggestion is 'nothing but a gigantic bluff.' Such an attack on religion is a counsel of despair. We have an anointing from the anointed Christ, or an 'earnest,' a first instalment of God's Holy Spirit. Nothing can shake or alter that fact.

The Johannine Doctrine of the Logos.

BY THE REVEREND ARCHIBALD B. D. ALEXANDER, D.D., LANGBANK.

THE ideas which centre in the doctrine of the 'Logos' are among the formative factors of human thought. The very word has its roots in the mental constitution of man from which it can hardly be detached. Few terms occupy a larger place in philosophical speculation, or have exerted a more decisive influence upon Christian truth. The evolution of the ideas it involves constitutes a history of the gradual unfolding of the conception of the Divine Being and His relation to the finite world.

In classical Greek 'Logos' signifies both *Word* and *Reason*—(*Oratio* and *Ratio*). Nothing better discloses the philosophic grasp of the Greek mind than this double significance. Though in N.T. language the term is usually employed in the sense of 'word' merely, we cannot quite dissociate the

two significations. Every word has a thought behind it. It is almost impossible to refer to the word of God without thinking of the mind or thought of God. The term 'Logos' denotes, on the one hand, the idea inwardly conceived in the mind; and on the other, the idea outwardly expressed by the vehicle of language. Thought and speech are indissolubly blended, and in the use of the term, whether by the Greek philosophers, Philo and the Alexandrian Fathers, or the author of the Fourth Gospel, both notions of Thought and its Expression are intimately connected.

I.

In order to deal adequately with the subject it would be desirable to trace the evolution of the

Logos-Doctrine from its earliest appearance in Greek Philosophy, through its Jewish and Alexandrian phases, until it attained its fullest expression in the Fourth Gospel. The limits of space, however, do not permit of more than a mere reference to the speculations of Heraclitus and Plato, to the theories of Stoic Philosophy, or to the parallel movement in Hebrew thought represented by the Theophanies and Personifications of the Wisdom literature. A brief account of the doctrine as it took shape in the hands of Philo will be all the more necessary to a proper appreciation of the Johannine Logos.

According to Greek thought, the Logos was conceived as a rational principle or impersonal energy—‘the regal principle of intelligence,’ as Plato calls it—by means of which the world of order was fashioned. According to Jewish thought the Logos was regarded merely as the mediating agent or personal organ of the Divine Being. In the philosophy of Alexandria, of which Philo was the earliest and not the least illustrious exponent, the two phases of thought were combined. Hellenic speculation was united with Hebrew teaching for the purpose of showing that the Old Testament contained the true philosophy of God and the world, and at the same time embodied all that was highest and most worthy in Greek reflection. In Philo, the two streams, hitherto running parallel, meet and henceforth flow in a common bed. The all-pervading ‘Fire’ of Heraclitus, the ‘Archetypal Ideas’ of Plato, the ‘Teleological Reason’ of Aristotle, the ‘Immanent Order’ of Stoicism—are taken up and fused with the Jewish conception of the all-transcending and all-compassing Jehovah; with the result that an entirely new idea of God as the Architect and Maker of the world is formulated.

Philo separates the energy of God from its manifestation in the world, and therefore finds it necessary to connect the one with the other by the interposition of a subordinate power. The double meaning of Logos, as thought and speech, is made use of by Philo to explain the relation subsisting between the ideal world as it is in the mind of God and the sensible universe which is its visible embodiment. He distinguishes therefore between the Logos inherent in God (λόγος ἐνδιάθετος) and the Logos emanating from God (λόγος προφορικός). Though in His inner essence God is incomprehensible, He has created the intelligible cosmos by

His self-activity. According to Philo, therefore, the Logos is the self-active energy manifested in the rational order of the visible world. It is, however, to be distinguished from God, as instrument from cause. As the instrument by which the Deity has made the world, the Logos is intermediate between the Divine and the human; ‘neither unbegotten as God, nor begotten as man.’ Again, viewed as the expressed thought or word, and therefore as the rational principle of the sensible world, the Logos is called ‘the Eldest’ or ‘First-Born Son of God.’ It is also sometimes named ‘the Man of God,’ as the father of all noble men; or ‘the Heavenly Man,’ in contrast to Adam—‘the earthly man.’ It is still further styled ‘the Second God,’ as that part of the Deity which is alone visible. From this it follows that the Logos must be regarded as the ‘Mediator’ between God and man. He is named the ‘Bond’ (δέσμος) of all things, which holds together all parts of the universe; the ‘Law’ which determines the harmony of the world and presides over the affairs and destinies of man. More than once Philo speaks of the Logos as the ‘Intercessor’ or ‘High Priest’ of humanity; and sometimes even, using Biblical language, he calls it the ‘Manna from Heaven,’ ‘the living Stream,’ ‘the Rock,’ ‘the Cloud.’

When we read these various expressions which bear a striking resemblance to N.T. descriptions of the Christ, we are naturally led to ask: Is Philo’s Logos a personal being or a pure abstraction? The author himself is silent on that point. The Greek and the Jew within him are hopelessly at issue. That he personifies the Logos is implied in some of the titles he uses. But it is one thing to present the Logos under these figures; another, to maintain that the Logos is a real person. After all has been said, I incline to agree with those who believe that the Philonic Logos resolves itself into little more than a group of Divine ideas, and is to be interpreted not as a distinct person, but simply as the thought of God which is expressed in the rational order of the visible world.

In these speculations of Philo, whose thought is so frequently couched in Biblical language, we have the gropings of a sincere mind after a truth which was only disclosed in its fullness by the revelation of Pentecost. In this pious thinker ‘Greek Philosophy,’ as it has been finely said, ‘almost stood at the door of the Christian Church,’ and if the Alexandrian Jew did not create the Christian

doctrine, he did not a little to prepare the soil for its acceptance.

II.

Without dwelling upon the Logos-idea in other parts of the New Testament,¹ I proceed now to discuss the conception and its implications as it appears in the Fourth Gospel. The Evangelist's peculiar use of the term occurs six times: viz. in the Gospel three times (Prologue, 1¹, etc.); in 1 Jn 1¹, where we read 'the Word of life'; and in Rev 19¹³, 'the Word of God.' The reference to the 'Logos' in the Epistle is disputed by some; while, in Rev 19¹³, the term naturally associates itself with the doctrine of the Logos, since it is applied to Christ as the Divine agent of Revelation.

In discussing the doctrine of the Logos as disclosed in the Gospel of St. John, I shall confine myself to three main topics: *Contents*, *Source*, and *Purpose*. The first and second are dealt with in this paper, while the third—the Purpose and its relations to modern thought—must be reserved for a second paper.

Contents.—A brief analysis of the Prologue shows that it may be broadly divided into two parts: viz. the Relation of the Logos to God, on the one side; and the Relation of the Logos to the World, on the other.

In the *first* part the author makes three distinct affirmations.

(1) 'In the beginning was the Word.' The Evangelist carries back the history of our Lord to a point at which it has not entered the sphere of time and sense. Nothing is said of the origin of the world. It is implied that the Logos was actually existent when the world began to be. When as yet nothing was, the Logos was. He was anterior to, and independent of, time. It is an emphatic affirmation of the pre-existence, involving even the eternity, of the Word.

(2) 'The Word was with God.' Here the personal existence is more specifically defined. He stands distinct from God, yet in eternal fellowship with Him. The preposition *πρός*, like the German *bei*, expresses, beyond the fact of co-existence, the more significant fact of perpetual inter-communion. The Evangelist would seem to

guard against the idea of mere self-contemplation, not less than utter independence. It is a union of distinct beings, not a fusion.

(3) 'The Word was God' (Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος). The author does not say ὁ Θεός. He is not merely related eternally to God, but shares the Divine Essence. No notion of inferiority must be entertained. The Deity of the Word is here boldly asserted.

There is no mistaking the desire of the writer of the Prologue to ascend by ever clearer and more concrete expressions from the eternal existence to the co-equal personality and substantial Godhead of the Logos. May it not be said that, in the mind of this thinker, Identity, Difference, Communion are the three 'moments' in the Divine relationship?

The *second* part treats of the Relation of the Logos to the world. In the first part the Logos is regarded as the 'Thought' of God, rather than the utterance of God. But in this section it is the Logos as 'Word' or 'expression' that is specially stressed; not only the idea of Communion, but the further idea of *communication* is implied. The Deity goes out of Himself and utters Himself in the world of Nature and life. The mind of God expresses itself in the Word of God, unveiling and revealing His thought in the material universe and in the souls of men. Of this Self-communication the Evangelist denotes three phases or stages—*Creation*, *Inspiration*, and *Manifestation* (see Prologue, vv. 3-5, 9-14).

(1) He is the *creator* of the universe of being. 'All things were made by him.' These words imply that the Logos is the organ or agent of the entire activity of the Godhead, and exclude the idea presupposed by Plato and, indeed, by nearly all the early Greek philosophers, and followed by Philo, that God was merely the architect or builder who shaped and moulded into a cosmos of beauty and order the chaos of already existent material. The word *ἐγένετο* (*werden*) suggests the progressive stages in the evolution of a world of potential being into a world of spiritual life, not inconsistent with the teachings of modern science. But it suggests also (and this is the profoundly significant idea which not only animates the Prologue, but pervades this entire book) the *primacy and priority of Thought*. God is first, and His creative mind is the spring and fountain-head of all that is. All being originates in Divine thought. And in all

¹ The conception is implicit in expressions used by Paul in his later Epistles, and by the author of Hebrews; but the word 'Logos' is never actually used by them.

the purposes and achievements of man he can create nothing, originate nothing, save as he thinks God's thoughts after Him.

(2) The Logos is the *Inspiration* of the intellectual, moral, and spiritual life of man. 'In him was life, and the life was the light of men.' He is the author, not of all material things and animal existences only, but of the manifold forms of the human spirit. The Logos is the life and light of the world, the vital energy by which all created things subsist and from which all derive illumination. But inasmuch as the higher phases of intelligent life involve freedom, a tragedy has taken place upon the stage of history. The Divine light, though perfect and undiminished in itself, has met with opposition. The light was not comprehended by a world which, in virtue of that very rational life imparted to it, chose darkness rather than light. The very gifts which were designed to exalt our nature have been used to debase human life. 'What makes our heaven, that also makes our hell.' This writer's reading of history is summed up in these few pregnant sentences. It is at once an experience and a forecast. 'Welt-Geschicht ist Welt-Gericht.' But the picture is not wholly one of shadows. The splendid idealism of the author which finds utterance already in the Prologue comes to finer and fuller expression as the story of Him who is the Light of the world unfolds itself. Nothing can extinguish the 'true light' of heaven—the light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.' Here and there, through the ages, one soul after another catches the gleam and sheds it forth like the Baptist, the witnesses and fore-runners of the Truth:

The Lord's lone sentinels
Dotted down the years,

who prepare the way and point to Him who came in the fullness of the time as the true Logos—the brightness of His glory and the express image of His person.

(3) The Logos is the fullest *Manifestation* of God. The climax of Divine Revelation is expressed in the statement—'The Word became flesh,' which implies, on the one hand, the reality of the humanity of the Logos, and, on the other, the Voluntariness of the Incarnation, but excludes the notion that in becoming man the Logos ceased to be Divine. Though clothed in flesh and dwell-

ing among men, subject to human conditions, the Logos continues to be the self-manifesting God and retains, even in the form of man, the character of the Eternal. This third phase of Revelation, inasmuch as it unveils the inmost essence of the Deity, is the highest and most perfect manifestation of the Godhead. In physical creation the *power* of God is mainly displayed. In the bestowal of life and light to man His *wisdom* is chiefly disclosed. But in the gift of His Son His Fatherly love is unveiled. All the perfections of the Divine Being are focussed and made visible in the Christ who is now declared to be 'the glory of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.' Thus the Logos may be regarded as concentrating in Himself the eternal values of the Deity and manifesting on the arena of human life the ultimate attributes of the Divine—Truth, Beauty, Holiness. The Incarnation makes the Life, the Light, the Love, which are eternally present in the Absolute Being, available to man. As these meet in God so they meet in Christ. They are the glory of the Word Incarnate which the disciples beheld, the Truth to which the Baptist bore witness, the entire body of Grace and Truth by means of which the Word gives to men Power to become the sons of God.

Throughout the Prologue it is clearly implied that the Word or Logos is the 'Son of God.' In virtue of His Sonship He is a partaker of the Father's essence. The expressions 'Word' and 'Son' if taken separately might lead to, and have led to, error. Their union protects us from regarding the Logos as a mere abstraction; it saves us also from imputing a lower and more recent origin to the Son than to the Father. Each supplements and protects the other. Taken together, they present Christ before His Incarnation as at once personally distinct from, yet equal with, the Father the personal and eternal life who is with God, even—when He is made flesh and dwells upon the earth with men.

III.

Sources.—We have now to inquire whence the writer of the Fourth Gospel derived the peculiar phraseology which he employs to set forth his Christology. What led him to adopt the term 'Logos,' a word which had not been previously used by N.T. writers in this connexion, but which was prevalent in the philosophical vocabulary of

the past. It is inconceivable that the author lighted upon this word by chance or that he selected it without any previous knowledge of its history. It may be assumed that when the Apostle speaks of the Logos in relation to God and the world he adopts a mode of diction which he knew was familiar to those for whom he wrote. A new teacher necessarily uses the linguistic heritage which he has received from the past in order to make his message intelligible to others who have grown up under similar conditions.

We have already seen that the term 'Logos' had undergone a twofold and nearly parallel evolution. It had both a Hebrew and a Hellenic history. In which direction are we to look for the immediate source of the Johannine terminology?

It is beyond my purpose to discuss the authorship of the Fourth Gospel; but assuming that the writer is the Apostle John (a view now held by many scholars), as a Palestine Jew, familiar with current Hebrew ideas, it would be only natural for him to adopt the Jewish use of the word; and not a few students consider that here we have the probable origin of the Apostle's language. In the O.T., and particularly in the 'Targums,' or early Jewish Paraphrases, the 'Word' is constantly spoken of as the efficient instrument of Divine action, and the 'Word of God' had come to be used personally as almost equivalent to God Himself. Throughout St. John's Gospel there is apparent a marked loyalty to O.T. teaching. Some expressions, indeed, would seem to indicate that Jesus is regarded as the fulfilment of Jewish expectation ($\text{r}^{14} \text{ } 29 \text{ } 31 \text{ } 2^{19} \text{ } 3^{14} \text{ } 6^{32} \text{ } 48\text{--}51$); and the living embodiment of Divine revelation ($\text{r}^{18} \text{ } 8^{12} \text{ } 11^{25} \text{ } 14^6$). But against this, it has been pointed out by Weizsäcker and others, that the 'Word of God' is not conceived as an independent being in the O.T. Though it is sometimes personified, it is never treated as a separate person; and still less as an equivalent of the Messiah. Moreover, the Rabbinical doctrine of the *Memra* of God is of later date than the Gospel, and therefore could not be the source of its diction. At the same time, the Hebrew cast of thought cannot be denied, and the many affinities of the Johannine Gospel with Jewish modes of expression must not be overlooked. It may be fairly argued, therefore, that though St. John's knowledge of, and sympathy with, Palestinian thought may not be the actual source of his terminology, it accounts, possibly in no small measure, for his special appli-

cation of it. For, as Neander observes, that name (Logos) may have been put forward at Ephesus in order to lead those Jews, who were busying themselves with speculations of the Logos as the centre of all Theophanies, to recognize in Christ the supreme manifestation of Jehovah and the true fulfilment of their Messianic hopes.

Other writers, however, and I venture to think with more plausibility, trace the Johannine ideas and terms to Hellenic philosophy, and specially to Alexandrian influences. No one can compare the Fourth Gospel with the writings of Philo without noting a remarkable similarity in diction, particularly in the use of the word 'Logos.' It would be absurd indeed, on this ground alone, to impute conscious borrowing or slavish dependence to the Apostle. It is quite conceivable that both the Alexandrian thinker and the N.T. writer were subject to common influences of thought and expression. Hellenism largely colours the views of the early Church. 'There is not a single N.T. writing,' says Harnack (*Dogmengeschichte*, i. 47 n.), 'which does not betray the influence of the mode of thought and general culture which resulted from the Hellenizing of the East.' But while that is true, it must not be forgotten, as Harnack also affirms, 'that while the writers of the N.T. breathe an atmosphere created by Greek culture, the religious ideas in which they live and move come to them from the O.T.' It is possible, nay, more than probable, that St. John was acquainted with the writings of Philo, or at least with the general tenor of his teaching, and may have discovered in his language a suitable vehicle for the utterance of his own beliefs, all the more welcome because intelligible to those who were familiar with Alexandrian modes of thought.

But whatever superficial resemblances there may be between Philo and St. John, it must be at once evident that the whole spirit and view of life is fundamentally different. So far from the Apostle being a disciple of the Alexandrian or a borrower of his ideas, it would be more correct to say that there is clearly a conscious rejection of the Philonic conception, and that the Logos of the Gospel is a deliberate protest against what the writer must have considered to be the misleading tendency of Greek Philosophy.

The contrast between the two writers is even more striking than the resemblance. The difference is not due merely to the acceptance by the

Christian writer of Jesus as the Christ, but extends to the entire conception of God in relation to the world which made Christianity a new power among men. The Logos of Philo is purely metaphysical; that of John is theological. Philo moves entirely in the region of abstract thought and pure being; the thought of John is concrete and active, moving in a realm of life and history. In Philo, the Logos is intermediate, the instrument which God employs in fashioning the world. In John, the Logos is not conceived as a subsidiary or secondary being, but as the sharer of the Divine life; and as such is not simply an organ, but the prime agent with God Himself in the creation of the world and all Divine activity. In Philo, the Logos hovers between personality and impersonality, and if it is sometimes personified it can hardly be regarded as an actual person. In John the personality of the Logos is affirmed from the first and is the very essence of his doctrine. The idea of an Incarnation is alien to the whole mode of Philo's thinking, and is impossible in his scheme of the universe. That 'the Word has become flesh' is the crux of Johannine teaching. The truth is, that Philo strives, but with little success, to overcome the dualism which was latent both in Hebrew and Greek thought. A living synthesis cannot be reached by a merely external amalgam of Jewish and Hellenic traditions. He holds, on the one hand, to the idea of an absolute, self-subsistent Deity; yet, on the other, he is forced to conceive of a God who has some kind of relation with the universe, and who binds all things to each other in binding them to Himself. These two aspects he brings externally together as 'two different Gods' who yet must in some way be reduced to unity. But it is not possible for Philo to explain this unity without either surrendering the conception of the absolute God, or reducing the relative independence of the principle that manifests itself in the universe to an illusion. The only way he can escape the difficulty is by making one of the Gods subordinate to the other. The Logos, he

declares, is neither uncreated like the Deity, nor created like human beings; he is intermediate, 'at an equal distance between the extremes, serving as the keeper of the boundaries and as a means of communication between the two.' But this 'second' or inferior being can never reveal God as He is, seeing that, by His very nature, He is incapable of revelation. Philo again and again lays stress upon the absolute incomprehensibility and inaccessibleness of the First God, who is, by the supposed conditions of His being, beyond, and out of relation to, the whole created universe.

But here the cleavage between the teaching of the Alexandrian Jew and Christian writer becomes most sharply accentuated. It is impossible for the unprejudiced reader to evade the conclusion that, both in the Prologue and the body of the Gospel, the supreme and primary object of the Evangelist is to declare that God *is revealed in Christ*, and that the Logos, who has entered the world of human relations, is the manifestation, under human conditions, of the Fatherhood of God and the unveiling to us men of the mind and will of the Eternal.

From whatever point of view, therefore, we compare them, our verdict must be, that Philo and St. John, while using the same term, attribute to it entirely different values. The essential purport of the Johannine Logos is to declare and commend to the cultured—Greeks as well as Jews—Jesus Christ, the divinely appointed Redeemer of mankind. 'He is our Logos,' in effect, says St. John. But the adoption of the term involves its complete transformation. It is baptized with a new spirit and stands henceforth for a new conception. From whatever source it was originally derived, on Christian soil it is a new product. The philosophical abstraction becomes a religious idea; and the impersonal quality is translated into a living individuality who is declared to be the creative power of God and the eternal hope of man.

Literature.

CANON STREETER, already well known as a student of the Synoptic Problem, has carried the whole subject of the origins of the Gospels a long step forward by his long, full, and careful inquiry in *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (Macmillan; 21s. net). One of Canon Streeter's qualifications for the task he has undertaken is his interest in the varied departments of inquiry, results of work in which must be co-ordinated if the problems are to be solved. Thus with an inquiry into the manuscript tradition and the source analysis of the Gospels, two subjects usually studied in isolation, he combines a study of the cultural background of the early Church. In particular, he believes that critical questions connected with the Fourth Gospel cannot be profitably investigated without some knowledge of the psychology of Mysticism. This volume includes an illuminating contribution to that subject.

Dr. Streeter has a keen eye for the obvious things which are often overlooked. He points out that a cursive is not necessarily later or less important than an uncial manuscript, but we are almost insensibly led to depreciate the cursives unduly; partly because they are usually cited by numbers while the uncials have the greater dignity of capital letters, partly because they are referred to as mss while the uncials appear in all the glory of MSS. Further, editors have a misleading habit of quoting uncials in alphabetical order and cursives in numerical order. This gives a purely arbitrary arrangement of the evidence on any disputed point. What we want to know is the readings of the five great groups of manuscripts. Hort's warning is emphasized of the exaggerated importance attached to the mere number of manuscripts supporting any particular reading. Having given the reading of a parent manuscript, we add nothing to the value of its testimony by quoting others, however numerous, that are simply copies of this, direct or indirect.

Students of the Fathers know the difficulty of using Scripture quotations that occur in them as evidence for the Biblical text they used, since so often in the course of transmission scribes have, consciously or unconsciously, altered their quotations to other forms more familiar to themselves. But the manuscripts of the Gospels themselves

have suffered much from this same process of 'correction'; so far have all manuscripts but the earliest been harmonized to the Byzantine standard that 'of MSS, whether Greek or Latin, later than the fifth century, only those readings need be noted which differ from the standard text.'

Fortunately there has been one exception, the Gospel of Mark. Mark was less read in public and less commented on than the other Gospels; consequently it was less 'corrected' than the others; which fact yields the important Canon that 'research into the pedigree of a MS should begin with a study of its text of Mark.'

Canon Streeter attaches great importance to the Koridethi and allied MSS, grouped together as the @ family. @ is an uncial MS, at one time in a monastery at Koridethi at the far end of the Black Sea. After a series of accidents, including a disappearance for thirty years, it became available to scholars in 1913. The importance of its discovery is comparable to that of the Codex Sinaiticus by Tischendorf, or the Sinaitic Syriac. It is to Kirsopp Lake we are indebted for the further discovery that @ along with certain cursives already known, formed in reality a single family. This family gives a distinctive type of text that may be ranked with the three great texts, the Alexandrian, Western, and Byzantine (called by Hort the Neutral, Western, and Syrian). Canon Streeter seems to have demonstrated not only that Origen used that text when he was at Cæsarea (it has, for example, the famous reading 'Jesus Barabbas' in Mt 27¹¹), but that he found it already established in the Church at Cæsarea in 231.

This, then, carries one step farther the process of the localization of ancient texts. Westcott and Hort thought of the Sinaitic and the Vatican MSS as a 'neutral' text connected with no particular locality. On the contrary, they are now believed to represent the purest type of Alexandrian text. It is surely a reasonable innovation to restrict the word 'Western' to MSS of Western origin, *i.e.* the MSS of Italy, Gaul, and Africa, and to describe as 'Eastern' the familiar @ associated with Cæsarea, the Curetonian Syriac fragment and the Sinaitic Syriac, the latter of which, discovered since Hort wrote, may represent the older text of Antioch.

One of the puzzles of the New Testament is the

apparent complete disappearance of the earliest Gospel account of the Resurrection appearances, that in the lost end of Mark's Gospel. Canon Streeter believes that its disappearance is only apparent; and works out in detail the suggestion that it contained an Appearance to Mary Magdalene, followed by one to Peter and others when fishing on the Lake of Galilee, and that it was from 'Mark' that 'John' derived his account of these incidents.

Incidentally the most interesting suggestion is made that the word 'Gospel' as applied to the story of Jesus was derived from the opening phrase of 'Mark,' in accordance with the Jewish practice of referring to books by one striking word in the opening sentence.

The 'Q' or 'Sayings' source is dated at Antioch about 50; 'Mark,' at Rome about ten years later. The first Gospel which combines 'Mark' with a Jerusalem 'source' that may be several years younger is supposed to originate in Antioch about 85; while the final edition of the third Gospel, our 'Luke,' may have been written in Corinth about 80. No support is given to the theory of an edition of Mark earlier than that which we have.

The Fourth Gospel is dated 90-95, and is ascribed to John the Elder, who lived in Ephesus. Its unity is obvious. Canon Streeter has a 'short way' with some of the recent 'partition' theories. It emphasizes the tendency, of which we see a prior stage in Luke as contrasted with Mark, to stress the universal element in Christianity and to minimize the apocalyptic element. It belongs essentially to the Library of Devotion; but that does not mean the author was not interested in history. Whatever we make of the Cana and the Lazarus stories, the author believed he was recounting incidents that had actually happened. 'Creative memory' has no doubt been at work; but importance is attached to a suggestion of Miss Evelyn Underhill, that the phenomena of the book may be illustrated by a study of the psychology of mysticism, and that some of the events of the book may have been seen by the author in a trance.

Every page of the 622 pages of this important book will repay study.

ST. PAUL.

A book of extraordinary interest and value has just been published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark—

The Life, Letters, and Religion of St. Paul, by the Rev. C. T. Wood, B.D., Fellow and Dean of Queens' College, Cambridge (8s. net). We have had many such studies, both in this country and in Germany and America, but none for long that can compare with the one before us. For one thing, it is the work of a sound scholar who is master of all the facts, and brings to their elucidation a mind of singular freshness and penetration. And, in addition, while the author's main preoccupation is Paul's religion, he has given us new and original studies of the letters and of many of the problems raised both by these and by the incidents of Paul's life. The charm of the book lies partly in the simplicity of the style and partly in the sincerity and independence of the treatment. Besides, we have everything here that we can possibly want to come to an understanding both of what the Apostle was in his own personality and what he thought of God and men and salvation.

Mr. Wood's conclusions may be described as in a broad sense orthodox, though he is far from being tied to traditional theology, and his independence is everywhere evident. In regard to the speeches in Acts, for example, he says that St. Luke followed the ancient plan, like Thucydides, and composed them himself on the basis of rough reminiscences. But, indeed, the value of the writer's whole treatment lies in the fact that he looks at everything with his own eyes and gives us, orthodox or not, just what he sees. The plan of the book is biographical, but in carrying this out the writer has provided the most careful and elaborate paraphrase of each letter, with notes on difficult passages. We have also separate essays on specially important matters, like Paul's attitude to the Sacraments, the mystical union with Christ, the expectation of a speedy Second Coming, Paul's phraseology about the Atonement, and many other topics. There are two excellent maps and a bibliography. On the whole we should say this is one of the very best introductions to the study of St. Paul with which we are acquainted.

THROUGH ETERNAL SPIRIT.

This is the title which Professor Joseph F. McFadyen has given to the volume on three New Testament Epistles (Hebrews, James, and 1 Peter), which he has contributed to 'The Humanism of the Bible' series. The title is happily chosen:

for, like the Epistle from which it is taken, the book deals with issues of vital moment. In the form of a running commentary which never loses itself in erudite trivialities, but is always a living exposition of the writer's thought, the book brings all three Epistles very close to the modern man, and not least the most difficult of all, the Epistle to the Hebrews. The march of the argument of this Epistle is set forth with great lucidity; and the aim of its writer is thus defined: 'to give his readers a firmer grasp of the unseen realities, to warn them of the danger in which they stand, to remind them of the worth of the prize that is all but slipping from their grasp.' The exposition of the famous chapter 11 has caught something of the eloquence of the mighty original. Dr. McFadyen thinks it possible that the original destination of this letter was a house Church in Rome. Of 1 Peter he has to say that 'it is open to us to believe that Peter was the inspirer, if not the actual author of the letter.' It is not, however, upon questions of Introduction, but of spiritual content, that the writer has wisely chosen to concentrate. The pages are filled with good things, strikingly put. Here is one: 'The book of Job leaves us wondering whether there is any solution of the problem of unmerited suffering, or at least whether the author has found it. 1 Peter leaves us wondering whether there is any problem, at least, for one who has caught anything of the spirit of Jesus.' Here is another memorable saying: 'One can imagine that James might have found himself somewhat out of place at a conference on the reunion of Christendom, when he found that the principal subjects of discussion were "faith" and "order," neither of which, if we may judge from this product of his pen, had any fascination for him.' A book like this would be an invaluable guide to a preacher bent on carrying his congregation through any or all of these three Epistles, which represent such diverse aspects of early Christian thought.

IMMORTALITY.

Sir J. G. Frazer, F.R.S., F.B.A., of 'The Golden Bough,' continues on his tireless way. Here is the third volume, a study quite self-contained, of his inquiry into *The Belief in Immortality* (Macmillan; 18s. net). It deals with Micronesia, those dense masses of islands, for the most part quite tiny, atolls and the like, that dot so vast a part of the Pacific

north of the equator. It is an interesting story. Sometimes a wind blows eerily across the mind out of an unknown and forgotten very long ago. In the Carolines, for example, there are the ruins, immense and imposing, of a kind of Venice, which was built on islands and about canals, all overgrown and silent now. Who built it? Who destroyed it? What has become of the race capable of that? Nobody really knows, though there are native legends that have come down the centuries. In the Mariannes, again, so we are told, not one survivor now remains of the fine race who once lived happily there, and who for generations made such a noble stand against the Spanish invaders. All are gone, and their place is taken by a smaller people. These islanders seem to be likeable folk. In the Gilberts, for instance, they have always been a chivalrous race, both in war and towards women. In most places, indeed, women have a very strong position. Descent is usually traced through them; and in the Mariannes they are indisputably master, a husband having few rights and a somewhat pitiful existence. In the Mortlocks there is a version of the rib story of Genesis, and in several places sea-maidens dwell with men, but ultimately grow homesick for their own element and leave them. There is everywhere belief in Immortality. Frequently what happens after death has no relation to one's mode of life. In Yap all alike, good and evil, go to heaven. In the Mortlocks one has to slip between two rocks that keep clashing and separating. In Ponape a dancing master is the man to cultivate, since only if, by dancing, one can distract their attention one can evade the surly guardians of heaven, and rush in. But in the Gilberts there is a weird tale of a knitter, far more dreadful than Mme. Defarge, who sits for ever knitting nets, with his back to the way, yet with quick ears that never fail to hear the soul's cautious advance as it endeavours to creep past, and, reaching out a hand, he seizes it, and, laying it across his knees, searches its heart. If he find there dishonesty, uncleanness, cowardice, it is tossed into 'an everlasting nightmare.' Sir James Frazer promises a further volume on the Indonesians.

A NEW BOOK ON THE ATONEMENT.

Atonement, by the Rev. H. Maynard Smith, D.D., Canon of Gloucester (Macmillan; 12s. 6d. net), is the outcome of much reading, much thought,

and long experience in ministering to men. The readers whom Canon Smith has primarily in view are educated men, interested in religion, though not experts in theology, and the priests who minister to them. His aims, as stated by himself, are: to provide rational grounds for believing in the Atonement, to interpret the doctrine in relation to other articles of the Christian creed, and to insist on the life that should be lived if such a belief be true.

Canon Smith is willing to discard the word 'substitution' as descriptive of the interpretation of the Atonement, but not to abandon the central ideas it has connoted. The Old Testament sacrifices were imperfect; but he believes that, so far as they went, they were efficacious. In them God was training mankind, the same God who sent His Son and indwells in His Church. When Isaiah vigorously denounced the offering of sacrifices, it was not the cult he was condemning, but the men who, in offering worship to God, saw no need to repent of their sins that were as scarlet.

That suffering purifies is an idea found in most religions; it is also a fact of experience. Yet there is more in the Atonement than this. The conception of cleansing blood is found everywhere, though the mystery of blood remains a mystery which cannot be rationalized.

By patient argument and simple illustration Canon Smith seeks to meet every objection that has ever been brought forward to the doctrine of the atoning efficacy of the death of Jesus. 'It was the just One suffering for the unjust, the Sinless One for sinners; and when we consider who He was, the dignity of His life and its inestimable value; when we consider the wonder of His love and His willingness to suffer for His murderers; . . . we begin to understand that here indeed is a sin-offering sufficient for the sins of the whole world.'

Emphasis is placed on the new life into which the Atonement brings us, a life which is normally communicated to us through the sacraments. Among the more striking passages of the book is that in which the author shows that the sins which brought our Lord to the Cross were just the commonplace sins of everyday life.

HOW TO ENJOY THE BIBLE.

If the Bible is not read by our generation it will not be the fault of Canon Anthony Deane; for in his little book with the above title (Hodder &

Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net) he has shown how much pleasure is missed by those who, for whatever reason, refuse to read it, and how deeply mistaken they are who think it dull. He does not, of course, deny its 'immense inequalities,' but he skilfully reveals the inimitable charm which pervades so much of it, and he guides the reader to discover its beauties for himself. While criticizing pretty severely the Revised Version of the New Testament and some of the later modern versions with their 'needlessly debased' language and their 'too usual infelicity,' he admits that they may be profitably read alongside of the Authorized Version. The matchless cadences and 'sonorous Latinisms' of the latter version are appraised as only a man of letters could appraise them, and there is much wise guidance as to the way in which the maximum of literary enjoyment can be extracted from the various books—the Synoptic Gospels with their incomparable parables, the Fourth Gospel which the Canon thinks may rest upon a diary kept by St. John, the Acts and the Epistles. Even the difficult and forbidding Epistle to the Galatians will never seem dull again to eyes which have been opened by the Canon's persuasive discussion to its transcendent human interest at a critical stage in the early history of Christianity. The Old Testament is dealt with towards the close in chapters which bring out the winsomeness of its historical narrative, the beauty of its poetry, and the religious and ethical power of its prophecy. Saul at Endor suggests to the Canon the atmosphere of Macbeth, and he is led to believe, on the evidence of the parables, that 'our Lord prepared His teaching carefully. Work of this quality was not achieved without effort.' This charming little book is well calculated to revive a love for the Bible.

ECCLESIASTES.

The Greek atmosphere of Ecclesiastes, though denied by some scholars, is recognized by most, and it is frequently accounted for by the influence, direct or indirect, of Greek philosophy. The Rev. Harry Ranston, M.A., Litt.D., of the Theological College of the Methodist Church, Auckland, New Zealand, has written a highly interesting book to prove that its real affiliations are not with 'the contemporaneous philosophy of the higher schools, but with the maxims of the popular moralists,' and more particularly of the poets. His book is

entitled *Ecclesiastes and the Early Greek Wisdom Literature* (Epworth Press ; 6s. net). In the course of his discussion he passes in review Theognis, Hesiod, Phokylides, Xenophanes, Archilochus, Simonides of Ceos, the early lyric poets, and Solon, and he subjects them to a thorough investigation with a view to the discovery of possible or probable parallels of thought or expression between them and Ecclesiastes. He finds that while 'the atmosphere of Ecclesiastes is typically Greek' (p. 58), 'more Greek than Hebrew' (p. 115), while the writer was possessed by 'the deep melancholy of the Greek spirit' (p. 71), and his attitude is 'on the whole very un-Hebraic' (p. 30), he does not, speaking generally, seem to borrow directly from Greek literature. There is 'little or no affinity' between him and Xenophanes, nor, except for one fragment, does he display any connexion with Archilochus, nor, except for a few general parallels of idea, is there any trace of Menander, whom he could hardly have neglected, had he known him. It is between Theognis and Hesiod that the kinship with Ecclesiastes seems to be closest, but we cannot say with certainty that Hesiod had actually been read by him; his book is 'evidently an adaptation of much of the matter of Theognis for Jewish readers,' which he had 'gathered into a sort of note-book' (p. 61). There he found in abundance the sort of aphorisms of which he was in search (12^{9f.}). One incidental result of Dr. Ranston's view of Ecclesiastes is that fewer excisions would be necessary than are demanded by the current critical theory. The book, which is attractively written, sets the criticism of Ecclesiastes on fresh and fruitful lines.

DAVID HUME.

If the greatness of a philosophic thinker is to be measured by his influence in stimulating other minds, then David Hume is entitled to a place in the front rank. Not only did his scepticism call forth the mighty response of the idealism of Kant, but in more recent times a fresh interest has been awakened in his writings, and certain new and live doctrines of a constructive nature, variously called pragmatism, experimentalism, humanism, or realism, have traced their lineage back to him. *Studies in the Philosophy of David Hume*, by Mr. Charles W. Hendel (Milford ; 18s. net), is a well-informed and careful review of his philosophy. It is more than that, however, for it is also a biography,

at least to the extent of linking up Hume's career and personal experiences as a man of letters with his system of thought. This gives to the book a degree of human interest unusual in such works. In estimating Hume's position the writer lays special stress on the 'Dialogues' which Hume was so anxious to bequeath to posterity and which contain his ripest work. The general conclusion reached is that Hume was much more than the pure sceptic. 'He is often considered to have denied the possibility of any truth beyond sense perception and to have adhered to a mental atomism which naturally belies our experience. . . . Is it not amazing, if we take such a view of Hume, to find him everywhere interesting himself in the complex, and not in the discreet, simple sensations? Complex ideas, complex impressions, the moral and religious sentiments, these are the objects of his persistent study.' Towards the close of the 'Dialogues' he puts these words into the mouth of Philo the sceptic, 'You, Cleanthes, with whom I live in unreserved intimacy, you are sensible that, notwithstanding the freedom of my conversation, and my love of singular arguments, no one has a deeper sense of religion impressed on his mind, or pays a more profound adoration to the Divine Being, as he discovers himself to reason, in the inexplicable contrivance and artifice of Nature.' The concluding part of the 'Dialogues' is in the tone of a confession of faith, and that work, bequeathed to posterity along with the 'Autobiography,' may be taken as a personal revelation of Hume, who was really known to but a few very intimate friends. To a presumptuous individual who took upon himself to explain to the philosopher that his uncommon grief on the occasion of his mother's death was really due to his lack of religious belief, Hume with great restraint replied, 'Though I throw out my speculations to entertain the learned and metaphysical world, yet, in other things, I do not think so differently from the rest of the world as you imagine.'

The erratic personality of Shelley has afforded material for many discussions, and it was quite certain that sooner or later the 'new psychology' would lay hands on it as it has done on everything in heaven and on earth. *The Psychology of the Poet Shelley* is the first effort of psycho-analysis to explain Shelley. The writers are Mr. Edward Carpenter

and Mr. George Barnefield, and the publishers, Messrs. Allen & Unwin (4s. 6d. net). Neither of the authors is a professional psycho-analyst, but they find in the modern theory of Repression the explanation of the weird features of Shelley's life and work. 'Repressed homo-sexuality,' with its resulting Paranoia and (in Shelley's case) a kind of intermediate sexuality, there we have it all. The book is interesting enough, and almost any explanation of so bizarre a personality might have something to say for itself. In any case Shelley is just the kind of subject over whom Freud and his followers would gloat.

Dr. Daniel J. Fleming has written a book, live as an electric wire, on a live subject—*Whither Bound in Missions* (Association Press, New York). It is an ardent statement of that new outlook which, more and more, is becoming habitual in the foreign field (if Dr. Fleming will permit that phrase, for he is somewhat touchily sensitive about such matters). That is, of course, that the only possible mode of approach to those of other faiths is through courtesy and sympathy, and a willingness to learn as well as teach: that a clear-cut line of distinction must be heavily drawn between Christianity, which is for every one, and our Western type of civilization, which is not, and which many Easterns feel is what is really being offered them: that the Churches in each of the lands new to the faith have the right of thinking out Christ for themselves, and gradually building up their own theologies, not simply to be tricked out unnaturally in Western thought, to them cumbrous and uncomfortable; that native men and women (whom Dr. Fleming, surely somewhat cruelly, wants us to call 'nationals') must more and more take the front places as the natural leaders of their own people, with the Western missionaries falling in behind them; and that the most effective piece of missionary work that any one can do is, wherever he be, to live out Christ in his own life and business, so doing what in him lies to remove what is the greatest of all stumbling-blocks, that ugly fact that Christian lands are so imperfectly Christian and, so far, tell steadily against Christ. All that seems fairly axiomatic nowadays. But Dr. Fleming feels that we in the home lands are not keeping abreast in these matters with those in the actual fields. And therefore he has flung out this challenging, powerful, broad-minded, if at places just a little strident, book.

A short biography of *David Charters*, Engineer, Doctor, and Missionary, has been published by Messrs. A. & C. Black (5s. net). Dr. Charters was in constant communication during his years in Africa with the Coats family at Paisley, and this biography has been prepared, as it is modestly put, 'from material compiled by Victoria T. Coats.' The account opens with the story that at twelve years old David Charters got hold of the *Life of Livingstone* and was much impressed by it. After reading it one day he sat with his head inside the oven, explaining to his horrified mother 'that he wanted to go out to Africa as a missionary, and was trying if he could stand the heat.' Less than twenty years after this Charters met his death in mysterious fashion at Kibwezi, having, it was thought, fallen into an ambush of some of the Masai tribe. But he had already laid the foundation of a mission which was very wide in its scope, not only evangelizing but also healing the native and training him to work. It was this mission at Kibwezi which was the beginning of the Kikuyu mission. This is the first time that any attempt has been made to give an account of Dr. Charters' life, and it was well worth doing.

A delightful packet of cardboard dolls for painting and cutting out is sent by the Church Missionary Society with the title *Picture Friends*. It is good propaganda mission work and at the same time the joy of the average child's heart. The price is 6d.

Nothing is more needed in the religious world at present than sound instruction about the Bible, and especially about the true basis of belief in it as the Word of God. It would be difficult to find any guide in this region more competent to give help than the Rev. R. F. Horton, D.D., and he has put us all under a debt to him for his little book, *The Revolt from the Bible* (James Clarke; 6d. net).

The aim of Professor T. Jollie Smith, M.A., in his *Studies in Criticism and Revelation* (Epworth Press; 5s. net), is 'to disturb the dogmatic slumbers of the Higher Critics.' 'It is against Wellhausen and his teaching,' he assures us, 'that I take my stand.' 'These men'—men of Wellhausen's type—'are wrong and all their teaching wrong.' The man who writes thus is obviously very conscious of a mission; it is only a pity that his mission were not more worth while. A book

of this kind carries no conviction whatever to one who has been trained to use his eyes upon the literary phenomena of the Bible; and it is significant that Dr. Norwood of the City Temple, who writes a Foreword to the book, finds it necessary to say, 'It seems to me that he attacks the modern critical movement far too entirely as if it were but a hostile thing, and that he expects far too complete a return to an attitude towards the Bible from which many have moved irretrievably away.'

A very charming and interesting book has been written on the 'lost sayings' or agrapha of Jesus: *The Unwritten Sayings of Jesus*, by Mr. E. J. Jenkinson (Epworth Press; 5s. net). The writer is a student of the Didsbury Wesleyan College, and acknowledges obligations to Dr. Rendel Harris. He seems to us to have imbibed from that distinguished scholar more than information, for his writing exhibits the same combination of humour, quaint knowledge, and exact scholarship which makes Dr. Harris's works so fascinating. Mr. Jenkinson has cast his net wide and searched in many seas for the treasure he sets before us. His book contains one of the most complete collections of the unwritten sayings in English, and the fashion in which he has recorded his discoveries makes his chapters full of suggestion and interest. Out-of-the-way bits of information, racy anecdotes, and comments and shrewd criticism enliven his pages, so that what is actually a work of exact and sound learning proves easy and delightful reading.

The first chapter in *The Undiscovered Country and the Way to it*, by the Right Rev. G. H. S. Walpole, D.D. (Gardner; 5s. net), is a sermon which the Bishop preached in St. Paul's Cathedral. It is given because it was this sermon that really made him conceive the idea of a book which should deal with Christ's teaching on this life and its relation to the life to come. The sermon we have given in 'In the Study,' and in it Dr. Walpole describes the peculiar circumstances which drove him to deal with the future life on this particular occasion. So there was a chain of events which has fortunately led to this new exposition of the 14th, 15th, and 16th chapters of St. John's Gospel. He chose this Scripture channel so that in his teaching on the life to come he would not fall into the danger of the too free use of the imagination, but would be obliged to confine his teaching within it. 'This treatment,'

Dr. Walpole says, 'makes no claim to compete with Dr. Swete's incomparable exposition of the same chapters. That was written from a scholar's point of view to tell us as nearly as possible what Christ's words meant to the disciples. My endeavour has been to discover and show what they mean to us.' The volume is full of suggestion.

It is a rare thing for the Archbishop of Canterbury to write a prefatory note to any book, but he has done this to *The Living God*, by the Rev. Vernon F. Storr, M.A. (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net). 'Few of those,' he says, 'who study its pages will fail to find therein what is fresh as well as forcible, and I commend it with all my heart to men and women who are ready at such a time to digest as well as read the thoughts of a teacher whose sane and reasonable guidance is based upon wide knowledge and fervent faith.' The twelve studies which form the volume were written for Lenten reading, but they are for every season and may be used most profitably to guide one's meditations. Mr. Storr deals with the fundamentals of the faith—the Existence of God, the Nature of God, God the Revealer, Man the Mirror of God, the Divine Transcendence, the Revelation of God in Jesus Christ, the Fatherhood of God, the Suffering of God, the Severity of God, and the Personality of God. His style is easy and clear, and his treatment shows ripe scholarship and a balanced judgment. We have given in a slightly shortened form his chapter on 'God the Revealer' in 'In the Study.'

Mr. John Telford's *Life of John Wesley* has now gone into its fourth edition. The present edition has been thoroughly revised (Epworth Press; 6s. net).

In *The Mote and the Beam*, reprinted from The Harvard Theological Review, Mr. George B. King shows, with much Talmudic learning, that one form of the proverb underlying Mt 7²², apparently was 'Remove the chip (or splinter) from between thy teeth' (שיניך ענין). The 'mote' in any case is not 'dust' or 'speck,' but 'splinter.'

The New Psychology and the Hebrew Prophets, by Major J. W. Povah, B.D. (Longmans; paper, 3s. 6d. net; cloth, 6s. net), is an expansion of a briefer work, 'The New Psychology and the Bible,' which appeared a few months ago. The longer book

deserves the same favourable comment as we bestowed upon the briefer one. It shows unmistakably how greatly the inherent interest of the Bible is enhanced when it is approached from the psychological standpoint. Many of the cruder traits, for example, in early Jahwism, are satisfactorily explained as the transference to the national God of the Power, Terror, and Caprice which belong to the primitive father; but Major Povah has done good service by showing that there are other features of that Jahwism present, for example, in the stories of Joseph and David, which cannot be so explained. Micaiah-ben-Imlah, Hosea, and Jeremiah offer a fine opportunity to the psychologist, of which Major Povah has taken full advantage. He draws a most suggestive comparison and contrast between Jeremiah and Hamlet—Jeremiah who recognized, faced, and conquered his 'complex,' and Hamlet who did not. In particular, the Book of Hosea, in which sex-experience plays so large a part, furnishes an abundance of instructive material. The tragedy of Gomer's life was her failure to sublimate her sex-instinct. Major Povah's book may be warmly commended, not least to those who know little about psychology and little about the Old Testament; and those who know something about both will learn how much the study of each stands to gain by being interrelated with the other.

A second edition of *Labour's Magna Charta*, by Mr. Alexander Chisholm, D.Litt., has been published by Messrs. Longmans (3s. 6d. net). It is 'A critical study of the Labour clauses of the Peace Treaty and of the Draft Conventions and Recommendations of the Washington Labour Conference,' and covers a wide variety of topics. The titles of the chapters are: Political and Economic Reservations; The Native Worker and the Mandatory Clauses; The Exchange and Currency; The World's Food Supply; Freedom of Association; An Adequate Wage; Equal Pay for Equal Work; The Employment of Women and Children; The Prevention of Unemployment and The Dignity of Labour.' In a preface to the new edition Dr. Chisholm gives a valuable table, showing how far the various draft conventions of the International Conference have been ratified by the different countries—a table which should cause some searching of heart.

Age ought to bring wisdom. It generally brings

humility. And it sometimes brings a deeper insight. And so we are not surprised to find something of all these gifts in *An Old Man's Jottings*, by Father Joseph Rickaby, S.J. (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net). There is nothing systematic in the book. It consists of nearly three hundred paragraphs, 'jotted' down in the intervals of a busy life on all sorts of subjects, religious, ethical, and worldly. Father Rickaby was born in 1845, so that he has now passed his eightieth milestone; and when a good old man speaks to us out of the riches of these gathered years, we listen with respect, even when we do not share his point of view. Busy people will find much to instruct them, and a great deal to interest them in spare moments in these 'jottings.'

In the summer of 1922 the 'Churchman' announced a prize of \$1000 for the best treatise on the subject of *The Christian Belief in Immortality in the Light of Modern Thought*. The prize was awarded to the Rev. J. H. Snowden, D.D., and his treatise has now been published under the above title by the Macmillan Company. It is a competent and orderly survey of the whole field. Having dealt with modern views of the universe and objections that arise therefrom to the doctrine of Immortality, the writer proceeds to treat in succession the natural, religious, and specifically Christian grounds for belief in Immortality, and concludes with some pragmatic tests and confirmations. It cannot be said that Dr. Snowden brings forward much that is new, either in the way of argument or illustrative quotation, but for the general reader he has given an interesting and informing presentation of a great theme, and suffused his treatment of it with a warm glow of Christian feeling.

The Bankruptcy of Evolution, by the Rev. Harold C. Morton, Ph.D. (Marshall Brothers; 2s. 6d. net), is a vigorous and captivating book. The writer, while making no claim to original research, has made himself fully acquainted with the history of evolution in general, and of Darwinism in particular. He has little difficulty in showing how far the science of to-day has travelled from the positions of Darwin. The theory of extremely slight variations has been driven off the field by the theory of Mutations. Over against Darwin's famous 'Natura non facit saltum' may be set the dictum of

Sir Oliver Lodge, 'So far from Nature not making jumps, it becomes doubtful if she does anything else.' There is also, among others, the striking statement of Professor Bateson, President of the British Association, 'It is impossible for scientists longer to agree with Darwin's theory of the origin of Species. No explanation whatever has been offered for the fact that, after forty years, no evidence has been discovered to verify his genesis of species.'

In the light of these utterances of eminent scientists, Dr. Morton is justified in speaking with some asperity of the popularizers of evolution in press and pulpit who speak as if all were known and certain, while so much is still uncertain and speculative. He quotes with effect the remark of Lord Kelvin, 'I marvel at the undue haste with which teachers in our Universities and preachers in our pulpits are restating truth in the terms of Evolution, while Evolution itself remains an unproved hypothesis in the laboratories of science.'

Really good books on the subject of spiritual healing are rare. There is one, however, which is perfectly satisfactory, because it is historical and complete and sensible, and that book is *Body and Soul*, by the Rev. Percy Dearmer, D.D. It was originally published in England twelve years ago and has now been republished by Messrs. Dutton & Co., New York. The English publishers are Messrs. Mowbray & Co. (6s. net). Dr. Dearmer's work is an inquiry into the effect of religion on health. It discusses the whole subject of the relations of body and mind and body and 'soul,' and lays the only possible foundation for the Christian truth that the body can be, and ought to be, healed through spiritual as well as material means. Any one who wishes a thorough discussion of all these topics, and especially of the central one, will find it here in this able, sensible, and Christian volume.

Another book of a much slighter kind has just been issued by Messrs. Morgan & Scott—*The Sacrament of Healing*, by the Rev. John Maillard, Warden of the Divine Healing Fellowship (3s. net). It is commended by Mr. J. M. Hickson, who is known widely by his missions. As a somewhat emphatic and earnest statement of the ministry of spiritual healing this book is interesting, but it cannot be said to carry anything like the same weight or conviction as Dr. Dearmer's.

What I Believe and Why I Believe It, by the Rev. J. H. Beibitz, M.A. (Mowbray; 2s. 6d.), may be warmly commended, especially to the lay reader who is unfamiliar with the technicalities of theology. It is a thoughtful restatement of the outstanding principles of Christian belief, such as belief in God, the Incarnation, the Atonement, and the Trinity. All these are handled with adequate knowledge, breadth of view, and clearness of statement. The aim of the book is 'to show that, on the intellectual side, the difficulties of disbelieving the Christian faith are very much greater than the difficulty of believing it.' But the writer is aware that the matter is not wholly settled by the appeal to the intellect. No vital matter is ever really settled thus. 'The real grounds of assurance are wider and deeper. . . . It is the whole man, not his thinking only, who is concerned in the great decision. In the last resort the issue rests with the will, but not unsupported by the intellect nor uninspired by feeling. And the fact that this choice, so momentous and so hazardous, must be finally a moral one, made by the will, which is really ourselves in the freedom and responsibility which appertain to us as moral agents, as it constitutes the supreme adventure, so is it the glory of our manhood.'

The Preaching of Jesus, by the Rev. G. L. Richardson, B.D. (Mowbray; 2s. 6d. net), does not profess to be a book on preaching. The writer's aim is simpler: 'I ask those who read to study with me some of the recorded sermons of our Lord Himself, that together we may learn and apply the method which He followed in dealing with all sorts and conditions of men, and may thereby gain afresh something of His Spirit.'

The Oxford University Press have included, in two volumes at 3s. 6d. net each, Southey's *Life of Wesley and the Rise and Progress of Methodism*, in their edition of standard authors. The beauty of Southey's style will always find him readers, but in addition to this he used the materials at his command extremely well.

Messrs. Pickering & Inglis have issued four booklets by Mr. J. F. Clark, the titles of which are *The Purpose of God* (6d.), *Successful Service* (6d.), *Consecration* (3d.), and *The Danger of an Assumed Conversion* (3d.).

There have been many books on psychology lately which appeal to the general public. The latest is one of the best from a popular point of view: *Psychology for Bible Teachers*, by Mr. Edward A. Annett (Scribners; \$1.50). This is one of the 'Life and Religion' series to which we already owe several good studies. Mr. Annett writes from the standpoint of an experienced teacher and out of a full mind so far as his present subject is concerned. He knows the literature (and that is saying much), but he has not allowed himself to be dominated by the 'new psychology' in an undue degree. The reader will find a sufficient account here of the 'structure' of the mind and its workings, of the nature of instincts, of the sub-conscious and suggestion, heredity and habit, conscience and feeling, the will and conversion. At every point the author brings his subject into relation to the religious training of the young, and has much that is helpful to say in this connexion. Both as a popular introduction to psychology and as a suggestive guide on religious education the book can be cordially commended.

Miss A. Goodrich-Freer, F.R.G.S. (Mrs. H. H. Spoer), has shown in several narratives of her experiences in the Near East that she is an experienced traveller, a shrewd observer and critic, and a writer at once informing and entertaining. Her latest book, *Arabs in Tent and Town*, should take a foremost place in Messrs. Seeley, Service & Company's travel series (21s. net). It merits its description as 'an intimate account of the family life of the Arabs of Syria, their manner of living in desert and town.' It is no hurried, scrappy narrative. It is the result of first-hand observation and copious notes made during the course of the last twenty-four years during frequent periods of residence in Palestine. Its preparation has been the writer's recreation during the last ten years. There is not a phase or characteristic of Arab life, either in town or in the deserts of Syria, that is not described in vivid and picturesque narrative, illumined, moreover, with many bright and sympathetic sidelights and an unflinching good humour.

To help those who go to Evensong to get more out of the service, the Rev. C. G. H. Baskcomb, B.D., has taken the various parts of it and written short

meditations on them. He has now published the studies with the title *Order for Evening Prayer* (Skeffingtons; 2s. net).

Professor J. M. Powis Smith of Chicago University has traced for us in *The Prophets and their Times* (University of Chicago Press; \$2.25) the long movement of Hebrew prophecy, from Deborah to Daniel. It is the fruitage of a long and intimate acquaintance with the prophets, and, though the narrative is popularly written, the touch of the expert is visible everywhere. Use is made of the most recent discoveries, so that the message of each prophet is set against an accurate historical background, and the numerous quotations keep the actual words of the prophets continually before us. Dr. Smith is interested in the psychological as well as in the historical aspect of prophecy, and he believes that ecstasy was a more pervasive feature of the prophetic movement than is commonly supposed. He ranges himself with those who believe that the pre-exilic prophets did not oppose ritual *per se*, and also with those who maintain that their pronouncements of doom did not rest upon political insight but on moral and religious convictions. He offers a suggestive treatment of Jeremiah, explaining his long silence and the fact of his being ignored when the Law-book was discovered, as due to the failure of his Scythian predictions, a failure which must have been humiliating and paralysing to a man of his sensitive temperament. The Servant Songs are regarded as integral to Deutero-Isaiah, the Servant is Israel, and the Messiah of Is 9¹⁻⁶ 11¹⁻⁹ is possibly Zerubbabel. Altogether the book is the work of an exact scholar who knows how to concentrate upon the things that matter.

Child psychology continues to furnish material for many studies, some of them barren enough and others useful because based on experience. To the latter class belongs a book by Dr. Alice M. Hutchison—*The Child and his Problems* (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net). Dr. Crichton Miller, in a Foreword, vouches for the worth of the author's clinical work, and indeed the book affords evidence on every page of the sanity and common sense which this lady physican brings to every practical question. On points of health, of discipline, of the cultivation of good habits, of the treatment of children's fears and nerves and 'difficult' moments,

and on much else, parents and teachers alike will find here a great deal of wise advice.

The relation of religion to sex is certainly a 'live' subject to-day, and Freud and his followers have accustomed us to some wild exaggerations on the subject. It would be difficult, however, to go farther in that direction than the latest of these Freudian disciples. *Sex and Religion*, by Mr. Clifford Howard (Williams & Norgate; 6s. net), is an example of the undisciplined imagination which in the 'newest psychology' takes the place of sober judgment. The writer sees nothing but sex everywhere. The corner-stone of primitive

Christianity was the repression of sex. St. Paul was obsessed by it. He was a neurotic. 'In his emotional reaction from what had undoubtedly been a life of self-indulgence, he attacked most earnestly that which had hitherto been his besetting vice—incontinence.' This, of course, was his thorn in the flesh. 'Eternal life through sexual denial, was his startling and arresting slogan.' 'Religious enthusiasm in itself is always symptomatic of sexual unbalance,' and so on. Religion is, it will be obvious, like the appendix, a survival which science is enabling us to do without. There is an element of unconscious humour about all this. But it is all useless and occasionally offensive.

Did Jesus use Testimonies?

BY RENDEL HARRIS, LITT.D., LL.D., D.D., MANCHESTER.

THE question we ask and here propose to answer does not mean, 'Did Jesus make quotations from the Old Testament?' If we read it in that way, it is not a matter of question at all. How could He avoid making references to the Old Testament, and what other source of authoritative quotation or of literary illustration on His part can we point to?

We are, however, familiar with the idea that the early Christian Church was in the habit of using the Old Testament polemically against the Jews from whom they were divergent, at various points, in belief or in practice, and that the passages which they thus employed were naturally subject to classification, more or less orderly and exact, under the various heads of belief or rules of practice: so that a *Book of Testimonies* formed a part of the early Christian literature and means of propaganda.

It is easy to see, when once the right line of sight is found, that the Epistle to the Hebrews, for example, is composed on lines that are capable of immediate illustration from Cyprian's first two books of *Testimonies against the Jews*; equally clear is the fact that the Epistle to the Romans, especially the chapters from the ninth onward, is based upon a previously existing and orderly collection of Old Testament passages.

But, if we are persuaded of this, another question arises. It is clear that we cannot employ the

hypothetical Testimony Book to explain the structure and thought of Hebrews or Romans, without raising the question, whether to any degree the same hypothesis may not be a *vera causa* for the quotations of our Lord Himself. That is what we mean by asking whether Jesus used *Testimonies*.

In order to answer the question, we should probably begin by the observation that a general affirmative answer is suggested by the Gospel of Luke, in the summaries which are there made of the post-resurrection conferences between our Lord and His disciples. For example, in the exquisite story of the Walk to Emmaus, we are told that the two downcast travellers were reproached by their unrecognized companion for having failed to believe the prophetic testimonies concerning the Suffering and the Glory of Messiah. A detailed statement is then given of what is contained in Moses' Law, in the Prophets, and, generally speaking, in all the Scriptures concerning the Messiah. Such quotations, in which Christ is represented as seeing Himself in the Old Testament, constitute a body of what Papias called *Dominal Oracles*, and we can hardly escape the general conclusion that St. Luke knew of such a collection, and that he referred it to our Lord, as the first to concatenate the *Oracles of the Old Testament*. The same Lucan judgment is involved in the account

which follows of our Lord's discourse with the Eleven, where we are told that everything had to be fulfilled which was written in the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms concerning Himself, in particular the prediction of the Passion (ὅτι παθὴν ὁ Χριστός), and of the Resurrection. The parallel with St. Paul's statement in Ac 26^{22, 23} and in Ac 28^{23, 24} will be sufficiently obvious to the student who will reconstruct for himself some of the *Heads of Testimonies*, and notice their constant Christological reference (Lk 24²⁷ τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ, Lk 24⁴⁴ τὰ γεγραμμένα περὶ ἐμοῦ, Ac 28²³ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ), and the part which the Testimonies play in making the Apostles into Testifiers (Lk 24⁴⁸ ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες, Ac 26²² μαρτυρόμενος πᾶσιν, Ac 28²³ διαμαρτυρόμενος . . . περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ). But what we have chiefly to emphasize for the purpose of our inquiry is that our Lord in His farewell discourse to His disciples speaks of the Old Testament references to Himself as matters which had been a subject of discourse with them *before* His resurrection. 'These are my words,' said He, 'which I spake to you when I was still among you.' It does not seem consistent to admit the existence of *Testimonies*, and then regard them as being entirely a post-resurrection collection. In some form or another there must have been, from Luke's point of view, a pre-resurrection nucleus of *Testimonies*. This general statement can be verified at once on particular points, by examining an Old Testament quotation, first for its currency in the early Christian propaganda, and second, for its occurrence in our Lord's own teaching. We need not repeat in detail all the proof available that in the early Church Christ was constantly spoken of as the *Stone*; this name for Him appears in every early collection of *Testimonies against the Jews*, and in all the *Dialogues* based on such *Testimonies*: it occurs everywhere in the New Testament, whether we look for Apostolical statements in the Acts or find them in the Epistles; in fact, there is no earlier or better attested *Dominical Oracle*. The oracle is based on a passage in the 118th Psalm, which is quoted, in an anti-judaic manner, by our Lord Himself, and it is significant that it is a part of the Marcan tradition (Mk 12¹⁰⁻¹²). Here, then, we have the strongest confirmation that a particular instance can furnish of the accuracy of Luke's statement, that *Testimonies* from the Old Testament are a part of the traditional teaching of Jesus. Mark

even suggests that the title *Testimonies against the Jews* is involved in the quotation, by remarking that the Jewish leaders 'perceived that He had spoken the parable [of the Vineyard] *with reference to themselves*.'

Clearly it is evident that some closer inquiry needs to be made as to our Lord's use of the Old Testament in His discourses, in order that we may find out whether any other quotations betray affinity with what we know in later times as *Books of Testimonies*. Suppose we take the Gospel of Mark, on account of its known priority in the Evangelical tradition, and examine its text in an edition of either the Greek or some other language, in which the editor indicates by special type a passage from the Old Testament.

We find our first instance in Mk 4^{11, 12}, where Jesus uses, what we may call a favourite parable of His, a statement about 'Eyes and no Eyes': we can hardly fail to notice that this passage from the sixth chapter of Isaiah, 'Let them see and not see,' etc., is strongly reflected in the early Christian tradition. It is definitely explained in Jn 12³⁹⁻⁴¹ as being an anti-judaic testimony on the part of Isaiah, and in the last chapter of the Acts, St. Paul uses the very same passage to the Jews whom he had failed to convince by his general argument from the Old Testament Scriptures. In the early Christian literature it was, naturally, a useful weapon in their ordered armoury. *They took it out of Christ's quiver*.

We turn the pages of Mark, and the next quotation we find is again from Isaiah, and it is introduced in a definitely anti-judaic manner:

'That was an appropriate prophecy of Isaiah about you hypocrites: This people honours me with their lips, but their heart is far away from me. How idle is that reverence which consists in following human teachings and taboos' (Is 29¹³).

There is no doubt about the wide diffusion of this prophetic utterance as an anti-judaic testimony. We need only refer to Justin, to the Second Epistle of Clement (c. 3) to Tertullian (*adv. Marc.* iii. 6), etc.; but as Justin suggests that the *Testimony* was once current in a longer form, which has a further bearing on the New Testament, we may profitably spend a little time on his use of the oracle. In his *Dialogue with Trypho* he refers to it at least five times, and always in a manner hostile

to the Jews: they are a stiff-necked race, a faithless brood, who honour God (as He Himself says) with lips only (*Dial.* 27): a people void of sense, who honour God and Christ with the lip alone (*Dial.* 39): they call themselves 'children of Abraham, and confess God lip-wise, whereas He cries out that they are far aloof from Him' (*Dial.* 80). When, however, we turn to *Dial.* 78, we find a longer reference: first Justin says that Grace has been transferred from the Jews to us Christians; for, as Isaiah says, 'This people honours me,' etc. (the quotation as in Mark with slight variations), and then he goes on as follows:

'Therefore I will again transport this people, and I will take away (*ἀφελῶ*) the wisdom of their wise, and the intelligence of the intelligent I will reject.'

We are at once arrested by the similarity of thought and expression to the passage in the first chapter of 1 Corinthians (1¹⁰), and we ask, Is St. Paul, like Justin, quoting an anti-judaic testimony? At first sight the answer would be 'Yes' and 'No.' He is arguing anti-hellenically as well as anti-judaically. Perhaps he has taken an original anti-judaic oracle and used it in a wider sense. Let us look a little closer at Justin.

In c. 78 he has added the anti-judaic word *their* before 'wise men' (*τῶν σοφῶν αὐτῶν*), and this is not a meaningless addition, but a part of the original testimony; for, when we turn to the passage in Tertullian, we find the following text:

'Auferam, inquit, sapientiam sapientum illorum, et prudentiam prudentium eorum abscondam: . . . sapientibus eorum, id est, scribis, et prudentibus eorum, id est, pharisæis' (*adv. Marc.* iii. 6).

We notice the same anti-judaic expansion as in Justin, and now are able to see why St. Paul goes on with the inquiry, 'Where is the *wise*, where is the *scribe*?'; originally they were both Jews: but St. Paul has modified the 'testimony' to cover both Jews and Greeks. We infer that St. Paul, Justin, and Tertullian are all working on the same traditional 'testimony,' St. Paul being a little nearer to the Hebrew with *ἀπολῶ*, and Tertullian a little nearer with *abscondam*. And if they are working on the same text, it is extremely likely that the original form was the longer text as in Justin, of

which the first part is used by Mark, and the second by Paul.

In this instance, then, we can hardly refuse to take back a part, at least, of a conventional anti-judaic testimony to our Lord Himself. We notice further that Tertullian has both of the previous testimonies from Isaiah in the immediate context.

The consequence of this inquiry is important: the primitive Christian teaching was anti-judaic to a far greater degree than has generally been recognized; and it was anti-judaic because Jesus made it so. There is fundamental hostility between Christ and the Jews, in the earliest days of His teaching, and in the earliest forms in which that teaching has come down to us. It was not due, only, to a sense of reverence for the Teacher's words that His disciples incorporated into their anti-judaic propaganda His references to 'eyes and no eyes,' 'moving lips and absent heart,' and the 'rejected stone.' These sayings are all a part and are expressive of an organized antagonism, to retort the Scriptures upon those who professed to be its wardens and interpreters. And if this antagonism is primitive, it is because Jesus was the *Protantagonist*.

To sum up the whole matter: we have found reason to assert that the principal use which the first Christian believers made of the prophetic and hortatory matters in the Old Testament, was to treat them as hostile to the Jewish community from which they emanated.

A comparison of the form (including arrangement and headings) in which these *Testimonia anti-judaica* are arranged in the earliest collections, with the quotations in the Acts of the Apostles, in the Epistles (Romans and Hebrews), and to some extent in the Gospels also, reveals a relationship which may be expressed in terms of heredity. Justin and Cyprian are in a direct line, as regards quotations and arguments therefrom, with the New Testament. And there are also links between the Apostolic quotations against the Jews and certain sayings of Jesus, together with summaries of His sayings and teachings, both pre- and post-resurrection, such as are suggested by Luke and found current in Mark.

The precedent for an anti-judaic use of the Old Testament came, therefore, from Jesus Himself; and the only residual question is whether our Lord's use of the controversial matter implies the exist-

ence of an orderly nexus, a vertebral column to the body of the later collection called *Testimonies*. We think we have shown that it is His method, as well as His matter, that is being followed by the early Christian believers. The conclusion would be even more certain, if we could believe, as many critics are disposed to do, that some corpus of testimonies was actually in existence *before* Jesus'

own day. Such a collection would probably be more justly described as pro-Messianic, rather than anti-Judaic. There was, however, room for some hostility to conventional Judaism even on the part of those who were looking for the Consolation of Israel; and, certainly, from such a nucleus as has been suggested, the evolution of the later grouping of *Testimonies* would be natural and easy.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

But that's real.¹

'Hath made us kings,'—Rev 1⁶.

THE other day when you were so dreadfully late, and breakfast was quite cold, and Mother was quite ratty, and when you did get up at last you had a horrid morning, and no time to wash more than the centre of your face, and the back settlements behind your ears got never a lick, tumbled your clothes on anyhow, bolted your food, had to sprint for it to school, arrived there hot and sticky, yet were late after all, and got lines for it too—what was it all about? Why did you do it? What were you thinking of as you lay on and on in bed? 'Oh,' you say, 'I was pretending.' Yes, I know, and I know something more too. If I weren't a minister, and if the people weren't listening, I think I could bet you sixpence that I could guess what you were pretending to be. Let's try. You were a general, and there was a big battle raging, and things were going badly till you dashed up the roads as far as you could in your great car, and then ran among the troops, and the news spread everywhere that the commander-in-chief was there himself, and the men rallied, and there was a wonderful victory. Was that it? No! Then, I am off it. But of course I get three shots! We didn't agree about that, but there are always three allowed. Well then, you were a traveller in the heart of Africa, with lions' eyes like balls of fire staring at you quite close out of the jungles, and apes hanging from the trees above you, and writhing snakes, and horrid little pigmy men who kept shooting poisoned arrows; one of them went through your hat. That

it? No, again! Then my last chance. You were a pirate, whose ship had just reached your treasure island, away down in the sunny southern seas, where the water is as blue as the sky is; and inside where the surf is tumbling on the coral it is as still as a mirror; and you could see the fish darting about far down, and the yellow sand at the bottom, and the skeleton of a man drowned long ago with a red cap beside it. That it? No! Ah well, then, if I weren't a minister, and if the people weren't listening, I might give you that sixpence. Of course I am only chaffing. Betting is a silly mug's game; and only a bit of an ass takes shares in it. But what were you pretending? I was a king, you say. Oh, but come now, that's not fair! You said pretending: and that's real. You are a king. What? Didn't you know? That's queer. Here is a fellow who doesn't know he is a king, and giggles when I tell him, as if I were trying to be funny. It would be awkward if King George forgot he was a king, thought he was just a private man, went out strolling, and the ministers with papers to sign looking everywhere for him, and messengers scouring the whole city; and if when they found him he waved them away;—'Nonsense, I am no king. Let me alone.' That would be a bit awkward. But you are just like that. You don't rule over England or Scotland or France, but you have a wonderful country called your life; and you can make it a rich land or else a very poor one, and it all depends on you. 'George, be a king,' his mother used to say constantly to George III. when he was young. 'George, be a king.' And you must be a king. For you are one. The Bible says so here. You must be generous and live in a big handsome way, a king's way. 'This is far too much for me

¹ By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

to receive,' a man once said to Alexander the Great. 'Perhaps it is,' answered the king, 'but it is not too big for me to give.' You too must be a king. It would do all right for an ordinary boy—ah! but you're not an ordinary boy, you are a king. And it won't do at all for you to sulk and say, 'It's a great shame,' or 'I will go, but I just hate you.' Be a king, be big and generous and do things in a handsome way. 'George, be a king,' and you must be unselfish as kings have to be. For a king works long, long hours. Did you think he just lolled about? Not likely. Isn't Dad the head of your house? (though I once knew an old lady who, when they said that of her husband used to add, 'And I'm the neck that turns him'). Isn't Dad the head? And Dad works far longer than you do. While God, says Christ, God never takes a holiday at all, works all the week-ends, and all Sunday, all the night and all the day, and every night and every day, still thinking out some new thing for us while we ourselves are all asleep. 'George, be a king.' And a king doesn't quarrel. To quarrel, says a wise man, is just to be equal to the other fellow; but to forgive is to be greater, for it is a king's part to pardon. Oh! you say, if that's the way of it, I don't want it, not one bit. But, whether you want it or do not, you are a king; and you must rule your subjects, or else there will be a dreadful time. Once in France a king didn't do well, and the people surged out of the slums and broke into the palace and took the king, and by and by cut off his head! You have noisy subjects hidden away in the slums of your heart, always ready to make some disturbance if you let them; your passions they are called, that is, your temper and your sulks and greediness and selfishness and crabbedness and crossness, and a whole crowd more, a horrid-looking lot. You'll have to rule them, or else there is going to be trouble. Don't let them jostle you about like that; tell them that you are king; make them keep order, put them down when they want to make riot and confusion. You remember Wat Tyler who led thirty thousand men in a rebellion. And how the king, who was only a boy, rode in among them, all alone! 'What are you doing following that fellow?' he said, 'I'm your real leader, follow me.' And they did. You're king. Well, act as king, and keep the peace there in that life of yours. And if you don't know how to do it, go to Jesus Christ, the kingliest of kings, the most splendid of monarchs, with the greatest and most glorious kingdom of

them all by far, and He will teach you all about it.

Recharging.¹

'He restoreth my soul.'—Ps 23³.

I was listening-in one night lately, with an excellent valve set, and everything was going well. The valves glowed, and the invisible waves of ether brought me splendid music and beautiful voices. I settled down to enjoy myself for the evening.

Suddenly the valves dimmed their brightness and the music faded into a mere whisper, and my programme had come to an untimely end.

Of course all you wireless experts know at once what had happened. You can talk quite familiarly about variable grid-leaks and condensers and reactions and anodes and cathodes, and a whole bagful of mysteries that your fathers regard with respect and awful veneration as things too high for them. But you know, and already you have said in your minds, 'accumulator run down.' Yes! that was the fatal trouble.

What is an accumulator? Well, it is a thing that accumulates. It accumulates electric current. It makes the valves glow and do their work to choose the right sort of electrons and reject the wrong sort, and make the messages that the waves bring such that we can hear and enjoy them.

There are two things about an accumulator. One is that it dries up. Evaporation steals from it and brings down the level, and it must be filled up with pure distilled water. The other is that it runs down; and then it must be linked up with the power that is the light of our city, and recharged. And we know it is charged when it fizzes and bubbles as if it were boiling.

I think our souls are a kind of accumulators. They get dried up. The air of this world sucks the sweetness out of them, and the level sinks lower and lower.

We must keep up the level by filling our mind with the pure water of the word of God; by reading our Bible and pouring the thought of God and the truth of God into our minds. That will keep up the high level of our thinking and never allow our thoughts to sink down to levels that are base and unworthy.

Our souls, too, get run down. We talk of our bodies being 'run down,' but we forget the same

¹ By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Glasgow.

thing happens to our souls. Life makes big demands on our love and our patience and our sympathy and faithfulness, and the soul gets exhausted, and would come to the standstill of utter emptiness if we couldn't get them recharged.

That is what we are doing when we pray to be helped, and when we go to church and wait in worship on our God. We are recharging the accumulator. We are touching the power of the Spirit of God, giving Him opportunity to restore our souls and to fill us with His Spirit.

And it's the same with the soul as with the accumulator: we know the one is charged with electric current when it begins to fizz, and we know a Christian is filled with the Spirit of God when he begins to fizz. Well, St. Paul doesn't say 'fizz,' but he says 'fervent,' which means 'boiling,' and it's the same thing.

I know people are less careful about recharging their souls than about recharging their accumulators. I know, because if it were not so there would be more Christians that 'fizz': more fervour, more religion at boiling-point, with the steam up to do God's service.

Boys and girls, I don't need to tell you to watch your accumulators. But I do need to tell you to watch your souls. So when next you trudge off to get the accumulator recharged, be thinking about the other thing too: you need to have the level of your thoughts kept up to the level of Jesus Christ, you need to have your souls recharged and filled with His Spirit, so that they shall not fail.

Do these things. Be constant in worship and prayer, and your soul will be wise to choose the voice of God from among the many voices of the world, and your heart will glow to hear His voice.

The Christian Year.

TRINITY SUNDAY.

The Omnipresence of God.

'Whither shall I flee from thy presence?'—Ps 139⁷.

The omnipresence of God is that glorious attribute of the Divine Nature on which we are to meditate. When you try to do it, you cannot limit the presence of God to any one place on earth, or in heaven: no, nor to all places on earth and in heaven, taken together. The whole universality and immensity of all things, created and uncreated, is all one and the same mystery of Godliness. All created things—

the most firm and stable—would instantly stagger and reel back, and dissolve into their original nothingness and annihilation, if Almighty God withheld His all-upholding hand from them for one moment. The pillars of the earth are His, and it is He who has established the world on its strong foundations. From a grain of sand on the seashore, up to all the endless systems of suns and stars in the heavens; from those creatures of God that are too small for the eye of man to see them, up to the choirs of Cherubim and Seraphim before the throne—to our ears they all unite and rejoice to sing—'In him we live, and move, and have our being.' 'For, of him, and through him, and to him, are all things.'

And then, if anything could add to the awe and the wonder of all that, it would be this other all-transcending truth—that He who is everywhere is also wholly everywhere. Now that Almighty God is wholly, and is continually, with every one of us in all the completeness, and in all the totality, of His Godhead—what an absolutely bewildering thought is that! Were we but able to receive it—we have our God, and the whole of our God, as much with us as if we had been Adam, new from the hand of God, and walking alone with the whole presence of God among the trees of the garden. There is a certain far-off image and adumbration of all that even among ourselves.

A mother's love is not portioned and poured out according to the number of her sons and her daughters. Every one of her children has all her mother's presence with them, all her heart, all her thoughts, all her solicitude, all her prayers. Till, wheresoever she has a child, that child of hers can adopt the words of the great Psalm, and can say to his mother: 'Whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there. . . . If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea: even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me.' Only—she might forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb: yet will I not forget thee.

But to come from God the Father to God the Son. What is this that God the Son here says to His disciples, and through them to us? 'Lo,' He says, 'I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen.' And that, be it well remarked, just after He had said this also: 'I ascend to my

Father.' And this: 'I go to prepare a place for you.' And this: 'It is expedient for you that I go away.' And this: 'If ye loved me, ye would rejoice because I said, I go unto the Father.' And then, with all that, He actually says this self-contradictory-looking word—'Lo, I am with you always, to the end of the world. Amen.'

And this is 'the truth as it is in Jesus.' This, that ever since His Incarnation, ever since His birth of Mary, our Lord has possessed the nature of man, in addition to, and in everlasting incorporation with, the Divine Nature. And thus it is that He sometimes speaks, and acts, in His Divine Nature: and sometimes, again, in His human nature. Sometimes as pure Son of God, and sometimes as pure Son of Man. As God the Son, He is with His disciples, and with us everywhere, and wholly everywhere, and to the end of the world. Whereas, as He is man, He is no longer with His disciples, but is with His Father, and with the holy angels, and with the glorified souls of His saints in heaven.

While His heavenly glory now and for ever endows His human nature to all its fullness; and perfects His human nature to every possible perfection; and crowns His human nature with every possible honour and reward; at the same time, all His heavenly glory does not remove, or in any way obliterate, or break down, so much as one of the true borders and boundaries of His human nature. His Divinity does not in heaven, any more than on earth, extinguish, or in any way impair, His real and true and ever-abiding humanity. He is now, and He will for ever remain, God and man in 'two distinct natures and one person for ever.'

To all eternity, and amid all His surpassing glory, we shall never need to say with Mary Magdalene: 'They have taken away my Lord out of my knowledge, out of my sight, and out of my presence, and I know not in what light inaccessible they have again hid him!' For, to all eternity, He will remain among us and one of us, the Man Christ Jesus, the Lamb as He had been slain. Only, for ever crowned with the whole glory of God, as He is alone worthy to be so crowned. Worthy is the Lamb that was slain!

And then, again, there is this: 'There are three Persons in the Godhead—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory.' That is to say, the Three Divine Persons are wholly everywhere. Sometimes turn to God the Father,

and say to Him—Father, I have sinned. Sometimes say to Him—Our Father which art in heaven. Sometimes, again, say—Father, glorify Thy name. And sometimes say—Father of mercies, and God of all comforts. And, sometimes, just look up and say—Abba, Father!

Then again, while not turning away one moment from the Father, turn toward the Son and say: 'Rock of Ages, cleft for me, Let me hide myself in Thee.' And again:

Just as I am, without one plea,
But that Thy blood was shed for me,
And that Thou bidd'st me come to Thee,
O Lamb of God, I come.

And then at another time, and indeed continually, look up and salute the descending Comforter, and say:

Come, Holy Spirit, Heavenly Dove,
My sinful maladies remove:
Be Thou my guard, be Thou my guide,
O'er every thought and step preside.

For they are 'the same in substance, equal in power and glory.'

But there is one thing to remember. God is present, and is wholly present, only to him who believes that. Our belief does not indeed cause God to be; and our unbelief does not cause Him not to be. Only, this is His nature and our nature, that He is to each one of us just according as we believe Him to be. If we choose, we can say with the fool—'There is no God.' Or, if we choose, we can say with the saint—There is nothing else in the whole world but God and my own soul. Believe in God and in His presence with you, and His presence is immediately and wholly with you as it was with David in the Psalms, and with Jesus Christ in the Gospels, and with Paul in the Epistles. Have faith in God, and in your own souls.¹

And now three thoughts about this universal presence.

1. The universal presence is an *arresting* thought. There is nothing on earth, when we are tempted sorely, so quietly arresting as a presence.

You remember the story, says Dr. G. H. Morrison of Glasgow, of Frederick Robertson of Brighton; how in Brighton there was a certain shopkeeper who had a portrait of Robertson in his back-shop. And whenever he was tempted to a mean thing he

¹ A. Whyte, *With Mercy and with Judgment*, 3.

went and looked for an instant at the photograph, and then the sorry thing became impossible.

Linnæus, the greatest botanist who ever lived, cherished an open heart for God in everything. Over his study door these words were written, *Numen adest, vivite innocui*. And what they mean is this: Live innocently; do not sully hand or heart to-day: *numen adest*—Deity is present.

2. The universal presence is a *sustaining* thought. Professor Henry Drummond used to tell about a student in the examination-hall. It was an examination of a decisive nature, which would largely determine the young fellow's career. And every now and again out of his pocket he took something, and gave a glance at it, and then as quietly slipped it back again. The examiner had his suspicions roused. He stole up quietly for observation. And he saw—scribbled notes? No, what he saw was not scribbled notes. It was a portrait of some one very dear, who would be dearer still in coming days when, for better or for worse through life's long battle, the two had become one before the altar. It was not enough that he should have God-speed. He felt he needed something more than that. He felt he needed, just what we all need, the sustaining power of a loving presence.

3. The universal presence is a *uniting* power. Do you ask how a presence can unite? Well, that is not very difficult to answer. Here are a father and mother who have grown estranged. Does the presence of a child never unite them? Did you never hear of them becoming one again through that little living thing? It is so with the presence of a common friend. It is so with the presence of a common God. Separated by a thousand leagues from one another, we are all one in Him. God who is there and here and yet is one—God who is everywhere and yet our Father—is the only real meeting-ground for mortals.¹

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Supreme Deprivation.

'Take not thy holy spirit from me.'—Ps 51¹¹.

There is no clearly marked sequence of ideas in the Fifty-first Psalm. What impresses us, as we read its verses, is the absence of plan and order. The psalmist is not intent on producing an artistically balanced and carefully finished poem. Like the swirling waters of a stream in high flood, wave

overtaking and mingling with wave, the thoughts and emotions of the penitent's heart pour themselves forth in confusion. 'An extreme emergency,' says Professor A. B. Davidson, 'does, no doubt, sometimes give something like a supernatural balance and calmness to the mind, but many times the agitation betrays itself in the abrupt and fragmentary character of the exclamations.' The anguish of this psalmist is 'undisguised by any 'supernatural' self-control. Acknowledgments of guilt, cries for forgiveness, promises of gratitude, and vows of obedience in the future surge up and break into one another. In a series of disjointed ejaculations the soul of a suppliant, exercised by contrition, is revealed.

There is a peculiarity about v.¹¹ which, though obvious enough, may perhaps escape notice. It contains two petitions, and these, unlike all the other petitions in the psalm, are negative in form. What is passionately urged is not that something should be done, but that something should not be done. Deliverance from a possible tragic separation from God is earnestly sought for. That alarming experience is represented under two aspects. On the one hand, the psalmist recoils from the idea of his being excluded from the Divine Presence, expelled from the secret place of the Most High. 'Cast me not away from thy presence.' On the other hand, he dreads the possibility of God's leaving him, withdrawing Himself from the fellowship which has hitherto subsisted between them. 'Take not thy holy spirit from me.'

The petitions are ultimately one, inasmuch as they both contemplate with despair the breaking up of a highly prized communion. But the stand-points, from which they describe the coming to pass of that mournful event, are different. With regard to the first form which the prayer takes, Sir Richard Baker says, 'God indeed hath a presence of being, and this is everywhere. And He hath a presence of power, and this is everywhere. But He hath a presence of grace and favour, and this is not everywhere. This is the presence which I so much long to keep, which I so much fear to lose.'

Let us concentrate our attention, however, on the second form. The language employed is quite adequate to express the deepened meaning which New Testament teaching imparts to it.

1. Consider, in the first place, *the magnitude of the loss which is deprecated in the words of our text*—'Take not thy holy spirit from me.' Think of some

¹ G. H. Morrison, *The Wind on the Heath*, 181.

of the deprivations to which human beings are exposed in this world.

There is the loss of worldly possessions, of sight, and the loss of life itself. Think of the state of mind of people when they are told, or when they begin to realize for themselves, that they have not long to live. In most circumstances it is a painful announcement to be entrusted with. News of this kind has to be 'broken,' as we say—given in fragments and not as a whole. In most circumstances it is a sad discovery to make.

Our hopes and fears
Start up alarm'd, and o'er life's narrow verge
Look down.

Only the few whose sufferings are very terrible, or whose infirmities are very burdensome, or whose faith is very bright, express a keen desire to be gone. The many, unreconciled or reconciled but partially to the great change that awaits them, cling to life and cry to be spared. 'Skin for skin, yea, all that a man hath will he give for his life.' People are exposed to many sore deprivations, but grievous as they are they are not for a moment to be compared with that which is contemplated in the prayer of the psalmist—'Take not thy holy spirit from me.'

2. Consider, in the second place, *what is entailed in this supreme loss*, to give some of the disastrous results in experience of His withdrawing His gracious influence.

To begin with, there is the inability to appreciate goodness and purity, and to respond sympathetically to everything that is tender and unselfish and innocent. He is not to be envied who has forfeited the capacity of being touched to the finer issues of his nature.

Again, a sensitive conscience bespeaks the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. But when no revulsions of feeling occur against the idea of our choosing the baser alternative, when we have accustomed ourselves to the fact of evil in our own life and in the world, and are past the stage of shuddering at it and vehemently opposing it—then we are strangers to the company of that sacred Guest whose presence inspires the heart with holy detestation of sin.

Once more, there is an utterly secular state of mind and heart into which men and women can only too easily settle down. It may be induced in various ways—by ambition, by yielding to care, by the neglect of religious exercises and habits of devotion. The higher affinities, in which our nature

seeks to express itself, are crushed. No value is attached to that conscious relationship to God which it is man's privilege to take advantage of.

Only that which appeals to the senses, which can be seen and touched, only what ultimately is material, is regarded as important. And so human life, charged with infinite promise, becomes impoverished in its desires, stunted in its attainments, shrunken in its aims and outlook.

3. Consider, in the last place, *the spirit in which this prayer of the psalmist's should be uttered*.

On the one hand, it is to be offered up in fear. That, against the happening of which the petition makes entreaty, is a real possibility. We know it to be so. Therefore we ought to be alarmed, lest in our case it becomes an actuality. Not because God is an arbitrary Being, who does according to the counsel of His Own Will, ought we to cherish this feeling; but because sin grieves Him. His withdrawal of Himself is never a capricious action. He cannot dwell with evil.

On the other hand, the prayer is to be offered up in humble assurance. We know of no other province except the soul of man, in which the Holy Spirit exercises His secret functions. There may be other regions, there may be other intelligent natures differently constituted from ourselves, in which He carries on His hidden and noiseless work. But all that is revealed to us is, that the gracious office which He fulfils is that of regenerating mankind, or applying and giving effect in humanity to the redemptive purpose of God declared in the life and obedience, the Passion and death, of Jesus Christ. Is it likely then that He will forsake a human life willingly, abandon His saving ministry in the case of even one individual? Not unless His overtures and entreaties are steadily rejected, not unless through obdurate indifference and sullen impenitence the ear is stopped to His voice and the door of the heart is closed against His entrance. He bears with us long, and is ever faithful to His task. He is God, and not a man that He should be turned aside from His purpose. The interest in us that binds Him to His gracious work is the interest of everlasting Love.

Spirit of purity and grace,
Our weakness, pitying, see;
O make our hearts Thy dwelling-place,
And worthier Thee.¹

¹ A. B. Macaulay, *The Word of the Cross*, 46.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Lack of Interest in the Quest.

'None of you asketh me, Whither goest thou?'—
Jn 16⁵.

It was strange that man's natural instinct of curiosity in the world to come should have been silenced. But, for the time, it was over-mastered by a great sorrow. The prospect of the loss of Him who was everything to them kept the disciples dumb. Sorrow had filled their heart. But in a few days this had passed. And all the questionings which, for a moment, had been thrust aside, found their complete satisfaction in the amazing joy of the Resurrection. The other life was now with them. And they never lost the consciousness of it. It became the background of their lives, the inspiration of all their thinking. And it spread to others.

For some centuries this consciousness lingered on, but when the world began its fatal inroads into the heart of the Church it began to fade away. The shock of the Fall of Rome gave a fresh impetus to its reconsideration, and Augustine's 'City of God' revived interest in it. But again it faded away. Then the Mohammedan invasions led men like St. Bernard to sing its praises, and Heaven was again a power on earth. Again materialism blotted it out, and then Dante, by his great gifts of imagination, poetry, wisdom, and philosophy, not only restored the old setting to life, but marvellously enriched it, and peopled it with living characters. He himself had visited it. He had passed through the dark blackness of hell, through the twilight of Purgatory into the full blaze of the light of Heaven. It is ever thus; when the glory of Christ and His Kingdom is dimmed by the predominance of the earthly interests of mankind, men are raised up to draw attention to it. So in England's national distress and seventeenth-century indifference, John Milton and John Bunyan forced upon the attention of an unwilling world the greatness and magnificence of the spiritual kingdom that lies about us.

And so again in our own time, when science, politics, and commerce had led men to concentrate their attention on this life as though none other existed, the whole fabric of civilization which we had thought so stable was shaken to its foundations. Universal losses called the attention of every one to the great question of another life. Where have our men gone to?

In the séance, in automatic writing, in spiritual-

istic photography, men have searched for such evidences of the life after death as may quicken the imagination. And now they are reading with avidity what Sir O. Lodge in England and M. Camille Flammarion in France can tell us. And it was only natural that, with this feeling of curiosity, quickened by stories of so-called appearances, some one should dramatize these secret experiences in order that the average man may see for himself what he may expect when he passes through the Valley of the Shadow of Death. So the world has gone in its crowds to see the play *Outward Bound*. There is the phantom ship, the ship of destiny; they see human souls that have left the earth and are on the way to another world. Not only are the spectators unaware that they have died, but they themselves only discover the fact with difficulty. They are the same in dress, feature, and character as they were before. They gossip, slander, and drink as though they were crossing the Atlantic. Their destiny is decided by the Examiner, a clergyman of a light and jovial disposition. He allots them their positions very much as a magistrate would in police-court cases. They pass to circumstances much like our own. This, then, in popular opinion—for the play won a great success—is the end of the mysterious drama of life.

It is avowedly modern. 'None of you asketh *Me*,' though it is true that 'no one hath ascended into heaven save he which came down from heaven, even the Son of Man who is in heaven.' No one, therefore, can know but Christ. But they have passed over all He has said and constructed a new world out of their own imagination. His world differs from theirs, not only in its spiritual character, but in three important features which are necessary if men's aspirations are to be satisfied. They are these: Wonder, Progress, Fellowship.

1. *Wonder*. There is an old saying attributed to our Lord which bids us 'look with wonder at that which is before' us. This, which is the great characteristic of child life which our Lord tells us we must attain if we are to see the Kingdom of Heaven, is always stimulated by Him in His teaching. He not only tells us of the 'many mansions,' 'the cities,' 'the right hand and the left' reserved for those for whom it is prepared; not only of the closer intimacy of the union of the married, like that of the angels, spirit with spirit; of the intuition that takes the place of the knowledge which vanisheth away; but He fills the whole picture with

the Presence of God. Heaven is just this 'going to the Father.' It is always dominated by a Person. And so vivid is this realisation that He taught one of His chief friends to contrast the present with the future in this one regard only—the Vision of God. Life's greatest romance has been well described as the discovery of God. Here He remains hidden. We seek and we do not find. Or we find and then it is lost again. We are always being baffled, sometimes coming so near and then finding ourselves so far off. 'But let not him that seeketh cease till he find, and he that findeth shall wonder.' For a time will come, must come, when He will be manifested, and when He is manifested we shall see Him as He is.

Does it bring terror or joy? That depends on the character of him who sees it. To a St. Augustine its glory fascinates. He writes: 'Suppose we heard Him without any intermediary at all—just now we reached out and with one flash of thought touched the Eternal Wisdom that abides above all. Suppose this endured, and all other far inferior modes of vision were taken away, and that alone were to ravish the beholder and absorb him and plunge him into mystic joy, might not eternal life be like this moment of comprehension for which we sighed? Is not this the meaning of "Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord"?'

2. *Progress.* Wonder, awestruck wonder, must be the first emotion, then the certainty of progress. The vision compels that. The great gulf fixed between the past and the future which Lazarus saw, and the immense impassable space which separated him from Dives! This represents the separation from the whole circle of the world's temptations. That is gone for ever. Sin is impossible. Darkness no longer exists. All the elements which impede progress here are absent there. The great gulf separates—there lies the assurance that all that is of earth is left behind for ever; never again to hinder, or press down, or weary. Progress is assured on and on through an endless eternity.

3. *Fellowship.* This is furthered by fellowship. Solitude necessarily leads to deterioration. We can only go forward through association with others. Left to ourselves, we go back. So Christ's picture emphasizes the fellowship that belongs to God's people. Lazarus is in 'Abraham's bosom'; the traveller is at last in the bosom of his family; the pilgrim is at home. But not the home of the mixed crowd; not the society of strangers who

may envy or slander or stand aloof in distant pride; not the fellowship with the indifferent or careless: but the home of the friendly, the interested, the good, the perfect.

Life is a great adventure, with an amazing prospect which may be gained or lost at the end. A man may say it is better to put aside such thoughts altogether. When the great adventure is over we shall see what we shall see. Why trouble our minds with what may never happen? The answer is, We cannot avoid it. Death comes nearer every day. And nothing is seen in its right proportion except as we see it in the light of that fact and what follows after. It is true we know not in precise terms what we shall be, but we know we shall be like Him, like Him in His glorious freedom, His wide embracing fellowship, and His adoring love of the Father. More we cannot wish for; better it is not possible to imagine. And it is when we give our minds to these high thoughts that we see earth and the things of earth in their right proportion.

On, then, with our Divine Leader. Do not be led astray from the path by unauthorized declarations of what men have seen and heard elsewhere. The highest has been shown us, and we must needs love it when we see it. Do we hesitate? ¹

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

God the Revealer.

'The secret things belong unto the Lord our God: but the things that are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever.'—Dt 29²⁹ (R.V.).

Just because we have a spiritual nature we attribute a nature of the same kind to God. We think of Him as Spirit, that is, as essentially creative. From what we see around us, or find within us, we infer that God is a Being of such a kind that He possesses qualities which are in some measure really akin to the spiritual qualities which we know that we ourselves have. Thus we are led to think of God as revealing Himself, or expressing Himself, in what He has created. Human beings express themselves by word and act. The artist reveals himself in his pictures; the engineer reveals himself in the bridge he makes; our daily conduct at home is an expression of our character. But just as our self-expression is not always equally complete, and we 'put more of ourselves' into some

¹ G. H. S. Walpole, *The Undiscovered Country and the Way to It*, 3.

actions than we do into others, so there are degrees in the self-revelation of God. The ascending scale of evolution is an ascending scale in the self-expression of God. The world of inorganic matter tells us something about God, but you learn more about Him from a rose than you do from a stone, for the rose has life and the charm of beauty. With each stage of advance new qualities appear, and these throw increasing light upon the nature of God. With man the revelation takes on a yet richer meaning, for then emerge the spiritual characteristics—moral reason, conscience, love and the like—which we believe most clearly express the Divine nature. Hence human personality is the best index to the character of God, when it is taken at its highest as it reaches out after spiritual ideals.

Now it is part of God's nature to express Himself. His action in creating a universe, in making man, in redeeming man, in giving a special revelation to the Hebrew race, was not arbitrary, but was the expression of His inmost Being.

If we study the nature of God as that is set forth in the Bible we shall see how self-expression belongs to the very heart of His Being. Let us take three great words and briefly consider them—Creation, Revelation, Redemption.

1. *Creation.* 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.' Why did He create? We cannot, of course, really answer the question, but it is not enough to say that He just chose to create. That makes His action arbitrary. Surely He created because He needed a universe to be the expression of His nature and purpose. It is His nature to go out of Himself in creating, to call into being worlds and systems of worlds which may reflect His glory and afford a field for His activity. Now, if that is so, it would appear that we must think of creation as an eternal act. In other words, there was never a time when God had not a universe as the medium of His self-expression. Our solar system had a beginning and will have an ending; but why should there not have been an unending succession of universes?

It is difficult to think of God beginning to create at a certain moment of time. What moved Him to create then? If He needed then a universe, must He not always have needed one? To many the thought of unending creation is very helpful. It seems to throw some light on the problem of the vastness of the stellar universe. Why are there vast spaces, these millions of suns in all stages of

development? The mind reels at these immensities, and we wonder sometimes whether the history of our petty planet has the significance which we give it. The more closely we can relate creation to the nature of God, seeing in it a necessitated self-expression of His Being, the more sure can we be that the little world on which we live has come from the very depths of that Being.

2. *Revelation.* To reveal Himself belongs equally to the nature of God. 'Verily thou art a God that hidest thyself, O God of Israel, the Saviour,' cries the unknown prophet of the exile (Is 45¹⁶), and 'It is the glory of God to conceal a thing,' says the Book of Proverbs (25²). But the expressions are merely reminders that God's ways cannot be completely fathomed by men, and that there are mysteries of His Being which baffle us. They serve to bring out more clearly the fact that we have some sure knowledge of God, which is ours because He has revealed Himself. If the process of creation has resulted in the appearance of persons with the capacity for knowing God and the desire to know Him and enter into fellowship with Him, it is not unreasonable to assume that God would wish to reveal Himself to beings who share His own spiritual nature. One of the characteristics of spirit is that it is essentially self-revealing. A spirit is active towards its environment, and its activity is most intense and most full of meaning when its environment consists of other spirits. The Christian believes that God's purpose in creating was the formation of a kingdom of moral and spiritual personalities with whom He might hold fellowship. But in order that such a purpose might be carried out it was necessary that God should reveal Himself to the members of this kingdom. The Bible, at any rate, has no doubt about the matter. It claims to be the record of a special revelation given gradually to a chosen people. It pictures God as communicating truth to man, educating him, unfolding to him His own character, and doing all this not capriciously, but because He was of such a nature that He must do it.

How was it that, alone among contemporary nations, the Hebrews reached the conception of God found in the prophets, which is the basis of all our modern theism? Their own religious writers unhesitatingly spoke of a special revelation which was given to their race. 'The secret things belong unto the Lord our God: but the things that are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever.'

'The Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a

peculiar people unto himself, above all the peoples that are upon the face of the earth' (Dt 7⁶). And how are we to explain Jesus Christ and His abiding influence, and His appearance on the field of history in close connexion with the spiritual movement which had preceded Him, if we refuse to make use of the idea of revelation?

3. *Redemption.* Here, surely, we have the best illustration of the truth that the activities of God proceed from His character by what we may paradoxically call a free necessity. The thought of God as Redeemer rests upon the deeper thought of Him as Love. In the Old Testament, particularly in such prophets as Hosea, Jeremiah, and Second Isaiah, love and tenderness—the love which forgives and the tenderness which yearns over human failure—are portrayed as qualities which belong essentially to God. But it was Jesus Christ who taught that love was the supreme characteristic of God. He was a Father, and He had all a Father's love and care for His human children.

Now what does love mean? We forget that at its best it is a passion of self-sacrifice, a power which makes for fellowship, the highest expression of a personality which seeks to find fulfilment for itself in multiplying ties of spiritual relationship with other personalities. Love is an energy of self-giving. In its very nature it is redemptive, for it seeks the highest good of others. Love ceases to be love if it is not active; sacrifice and self-surrender are the very breath of its life.

The vine from every living limb bleeds wine;
Is it the poorer for that spirit shed?
The drunkard and the wanton drink thereof:
Are they the richer for that gift's excess?
Measure thy life by loss instead of gain,
Not by the wine drunk, but the wine poured forth.
For love's strength standeth in love's sacrifice,
And whoso suffers most hath most to give.

If God is Love then, must He not of necessity be a Redeemer? His love goes out of itself in creation; to make a universe that He may pour out His love upon it belongs to His very Being. But His is a Holy love; and so when man misuses his freedom and sin infects humanity with its poison, God sets on foot a redemptive process, which culminates in the Cross of Christ, where Christianity bids us see the Divine love going to the extreme of self-sacrifice, that men may be won back to fellowship with their Father. The Cross was no afterthought on the

part of God, a desperate remedy to retrieve a ruined world. The Cross represents the heart of God. In His life there is always a cross, for an Eternal Love must move ever within the circle of self-sacrifice. 'Love's strength standeth in love's sacrifice.'

Such a thought of God as we have been considering has many results for our practical life of duty and prayer and service, which may be summarized in some such way as the following. 'God wants to make Himself known to me, to give Himself to me. He is seeking to enter into close relationship with me. It is His nature to do this. What remains for me to do, is to fit myself to receive all that I can of His fullness, and to make myself a channel through which His life may flow into me, and pass through me into others. What am I doing to hinder this self-giving of God from being effective either in myself or in the world? Am I in any way thwarting the Divine purpose?'¹

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Emphasis.

'Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith.'—Mt 23²³.

This text suggests to us a thought about life. It is itself an illustration of a principle in life—the need of preserving a proper proportion between one thing and another, and the danger of losing this sense of proportion.

This was one great complaint of Christ against the Pharisees. They made much of the things that were little and trivial, and they 'omitted,' left out altogether, the 'weightier matters.' They would 'strain out the gnat.' When they were pouring wine into a cup, they would pour it through a cloth of fine texture and so strain out the unclean midge, and swallow the camel. They would 'tithe mint and anise and cummin,' garden produce that was hardly worth noticing. They would be scrupulous and exact about such minutiae, and sin against justice and love. Christ rebukes them in the text. He says—Don't you see that some things are great and some are little?

It is a question of proportion—of perspective. As in a good picture, everything finds its place, nothing bulks bigger in the eye than it really is. Or it is a question of emphasis. You know that, in

¹ V. F. Storr, *The Living God*, 70.

good reading and speaking, the weight of the voice must come upon the words according to the sense and meaning of the passage.

How true this is of life ! For good living, as for good reading and speaking, it is a question of emphasis. To make life beautiful, to bring out its meaning and dignity and purpose, you must put the emphasis on the right things. And you may make life trivial, ridiculous, miserable, sinful, by placing the emphasis on the wrong things. Keep the big things big and let the little things be little—that is the secret of a strong and happy life.

Now, if there is any one who can teach us the true emphasis in life, it is Christ.

His whole controversy with the Pharisees turned upon this. It was a question of emphasis. The Pharisees put the emphasis on the outside of things—Christ on what is within. They put the emphasis on the ritual—He on the spirit. Christ did not trouble Himself about the tithing of mint, the washing of hands and cups, the wearing of the proper garment. He wanted to change the hearts of men, to renew them in the spirit of their minds. And what was ‘holiness’ to a Pharisee to Him was mere trifling.

Perhaps if we would sum up in one word the lesson of Christ and the New Testament, it would be this. Put the emphasis on eternity rather than on time—on the eternal things rather than on the things which pass and perish.

It is a safe and reasonable test of the importance of things—How do they last ? And when this life of ours is laid against the background of eternity, things are brought out in their true proportions.

The greatest Scotsman of last century was Thomas Chalmers. His life was divided into two parts by a great religious experience. And looking back upon his earlier days, when he was a brilliant student, and confessing the keen interest of such study and strenuous work, he said : ‘ Ah ! but I had forgotten two magnitudes ’—he was great in mathematics, and he said, ‘ two magnitudes—the littleness of time and the greatness of eternity.’

It is Christ who keeps us right here. He is the great teacher of proportion, of emphasis in the things of life. We can learn no greater lesson than to measure things as He did. Can we not see that nothing is more striking about Him than His standard of values ? Is He not saying continually to the world, ‘ My thoughts are not your thoughts ’ ? What did He live for ? What did He prize ?

What did He count supremely worth having ? Therefore think of Him ; try all your judgments by Him ; live beside Him.

Yes, live beside Him. For is it not also true that, in determining what things are to be important to us, a great deal depends on the company we keep ? If we want to live wisely, we must live with the wise, for the companion of fools is soon foolish too. We are mightily influenced by the society that is about us.

Christ is our teacher then, and there are three points we should remember.

1. We should put the emphasis on the things we believe. There is the same mixture in us all of faith and unbelief ; but this is the true prayer—‘ Lord, I believe ; help thou mine unbelief.’ Put forward the faith ; put it first ; put the emphasis there—‘ Lord, I believe.’

This is where many go wrong. They emphasize their doubts ; and that is not inspiring. What do we believe ? However elementary, however simple, lay the emphasis there. Dwell upon it ; live upon it ; and it will come to more and more.

2. Again, put the emphasis on the bright side rather than the dark side.

There is always a bright side if you can only see it. For the Christian man, believing in God and the great words which Christ has spoken to us, there is always a bright side, always a better reason for being in a good mood than for being in a bad mood. ‘ Why art thou cast down, O my soul ? Still trust in God.’

3. Lastly, let us put the emphasis on what we can give rather than on what we can get, on the things of others rather than on our own things.

This is the very mind of Christ, and we are taking our lesson in emphasis from Him. He emptied Himself, gave all He had, gave Himself for us. And who can tell the misery and the poverty of our life, because we invert the emphasis of Christ, and are consumed with a passion for getting and gathering rather than for giving—consumed by a concern about our own things and thoughtless of the things of others ?

What is this but to place the emphasis on the three great Christian graces—Faith and Hope and Love—these three ? And while we emphasize them all, let us place the emphasis again and again and yet again upon the last. For the greatest of these, and the greatest thing in God’s world, is Love.¹

¹ J. Rutherford, *The Seer’s House*, 227.

The Unrecorded Thunder=Voices.

BY THE REVEREND PROFESSOR J. HUGH MICHAEL, M.A., VICTORIA COLLEGE, TORONTO.

In the tenth chapter of the Apocalypse (v.⁸) the Seer speaks of 'the seven thunders' which 'uttered their voices.' When, however, he was about to write the things which they had uttered, a voice from heaven bade him abstain. 'Seal up,' said the voice, 'the things which the seven thunders uttered, and write them not' (v.⁴). What meaning did the writer intend his readers to discern behind the symbolism of these words?

The chapter opens with a vivid description of the strong angel which came down out of heaven, and set his right foot upon the sea and his left upon the earth. In his hand was a tiny booklet open. He uttered a loud cry like the roar of a lion, upon which the seven thunders uttered *their* voices (τὰς ἑαυτῶν φωνάς). The ἑαυτῶν is not without emphasis. There is a hint, and more than a hint, of a contrast or antithesis existing between the cry of the angel and the voices of the thunders. The view, sometimes held, that the voices are echoes of the angel's cry is put out of court by this emphasis. There is emphasis also on the word αὐτὰ in the command to abstain from writing (μὴ αὐτὰ γράψῃς). 'Don't write *them*,' says the heavenly voice. The implication is unmistakable that the thunder-voices are not to be recorded because another utterance is to be chronicled which will in some way contradict or annul them. It is natural to presume that this other utterance is the oath of the strong angel which follows immediately in vv.⁵⁻⁷. He swears by the ever-living Creator of all things that there shall be no more delay, but that the mystery of God will be fulfilled when the seventh angel sounds his trumpet.

The remaining verses of the chapter relate how once again the voice from heaven spoke, bidding the Seer go and take the tiny booklet from the angel's hand. When he asks the angel to give him the booklet, the angel bids him take it and eat it up, adding that whereas it would be sweet as honey in his mouth it would make his belly bitter. He takes and eats the booklet and finds it to be first sweet and then bitter, even as the angel had foretold. Finally the Seer is informed—by whom we are not told—that he must prophesy again of many peoples and nations and tongues and kings.

Archdeacon Charles is of the opinion that this tenth chapter, while serving other purposes, 'was written mainly as an introduction to 11¹⁻¹³' (*Revelation*, vol. ii. p. 412). If 'in part' were substituted for 'mainly' in this statement, it would, we think, be more accurate. We agree with Charles that the portions of chapter 10 that speak of the small booklet are intended to introduce 11¹⁻¹³. This view is in every way more probable than that which regards the booklet as containing the whole of the remainder of the Apocalypse. The use of the double diminutive βιβλαρίδιον tells against the latter alternative. A more compelling reason still for confining the contents of the booklet to 11¹⁻¹³ is that at 11¹⁵ the Seer *reverts* to a scheme upon which he had entered before he had reached chapter 10, for we can hardly think that the writer intended his readers to understand that a vision which is represented as being given through the booklet supplied the continuation of the scheme or plan commenced before the booklet is mentioned. Those portions, however, of chapter 10 which do not relate to the little book have nothing whatsoever to do with 11¹⁻¹³. On the contrary, as will become clear in the sequel, they take their place naturally in the development of the drama as a whole. They fill a far more important rôle in the Apocalypse than do the parts that concern the little book. Interpreters have been too prone to regard the episode of the booklet as constituting the essence of chapter 10, whereas, as a matter of fact, it is of quite secondary importance as compared with the remaining parts of the chapter. All this tends to predispose one to look with favour upon the theory of Wellhausen and others, that the booklet episode is an intrusion. Charles, however, will have nothing to do with the suggestion, on the ground that the style makes it clear that the whole chapter comes from the Seer's hand. 'We must recognize,' he writes, after examining the diction, 'that it would be a highly hazardous proceeding to break up this chapter and assign some portions to one writer and some to another. Yet this is what Wellhausen attempts' (vol. i. p. 257).

If, when the parts that concern the little book

are removed, the remainder of chapter 10 takes its place naturally in the development of the drama as a whole, and if at the same time the style of the whole chapter as it has come to us is uniform, it may well be the case that the writer introduced 11¹⁻¹³ as an afterthought, himself composing the episode of the booklet as an introduction to it, and attaching it to the parts of chapter 10 which he had already written. Some such explanation as this would seem to be more in harmony with the character of chapter 10 than Charles's view, that the chapter as it stands was composed at one and the same time 'mainly as an introduction to 11¹⁻¹³.' The contention of J. Weiss, that 10^{2a} disturbs the sequence of the thought, supports our explanation. The difficulty felt by Weiss is not altogether removed by the suggestion of Charles, that *ποδες* in v.¹ should be rendered 'legs' and not 'feet.'

This preliminary discussion puts us in a position to consider the thunder-voices more closely. Can we discover the significance of the command to leave them unrecorded? The hypothesis of Swete and Charles is not, as it seems to me, one that can be successfully maintained. They both interpret the command to abstain from writing as the Seer's method of intimating that the utterances of the seven thunders were of such a nature that it was not possible for him to communicate them to his readers. The voices on this view were mysterious, ineffable secrets, incapable of being repeated by human lips, analogous to the unspeakable utterances heard by Paul when he was caught up into Paradise. 'What the utterances were,' writes Swete, 'or why they were not to be revealed, it is idle to enquire; but compare 2 Cor. xii. 4. . . . The Seer's enforced reticence witnesses to the fragmentary character of even apocalyptic disclosures. The Seer himself received more than he was at liberty to communicate. He was conscious of having passed through experiences which he could not recall or express, and he rightly interpreted his inability to put them on paper as equivalent to a prohibition.' So Charles (vol. i. p. 261), after enumerating certain explanations, proceeds: 'As against these explanations I am inclined to treat the statement as a *bona fide* one, and view it in the same light as that of St. Paul in 2 Cor. xii. 4 in regard to his vision in the third heaven.' But surely the words of the Seer give no countenance to this explanation. On the contrary, they distinctly

contradict it. Where is there a hint of inability on the Seer's part to 'recall or express' what he had heard, or the least suggestion of 'inability to put on paper' the experiences through which he had passed? So far from being unable to write the thunder-voices, he tells us that he was on the point of so doing when the voice from heaven commanded him to relinquish his intention. The voices are unrecorded, not because the Seer was unable to recall them and 'put them on paper,' but because his purpose to write was overruled by the direct command of high Heaven.

It is as plain as can be that the writer is concerned with the omission from his work of something which he *could* have inserted, but which he feels constrained for some reason to exclude. This is assumed by J. T. Dean, whose interpretation we give in his own words. 'Can we,' he writes, 'reach a reason which explains satisfactorily the omission of the thunder-series of judgments and at the same time justifies the mention of them? The thunders would be a more solemn and awesome series of judgments than those associated with the trumpets, but yet of the same nature and having the same purpose as they—to warn men and summon them to repentance. Now the command to seal up the utterances of the thunders conveys the intimation that the time for warning and repentance is past. There was a time in the history of the Empire when more earnest warning might have been effectual, but that time has gone. Something has happened in its life that made further warning useless, so that nothing now remains but to take it out of the way' (*Book of Revelation*, p. 130).

Though the reasons that were advanced against the view of Swete and Charles cannot be urged against this theory, it is itself open to a fatal objection. It may well be that Dean is right in maintaining (as does Völter) that the thunder-voices proclaimed a series of judgments, but to say that the Seer omits them from the Apocalypse because the Empire is no longer capable of heeding their warning is to betray a misconception of the purpose of the book, for the Apocalypse was written for the Churches—the Churches addressed in chapters 2 and 3—and not for the citizens of the Empire in general. The purpose of its Apocalyptic form was doubtless to make it inapprehensible to all save the circle of Christian readers for whom it was intended. True, its message was one of warning as well as encouragement for the Churches;

but severe as is the censure addressed to some of them, they were not past hope. Every Church that is censured is at the same time urged to repent. The imperviousness of the Empire to further admonition would furnish no reason for the exclusion of the warning thunder-voices from a book designed for the Christian Churches.

Furthermore, how can this interpretation be reconciled with such words as we find in 14⁶? The Seer seems to be going out of his way to show that the message of the angel there spoken of is for all men, for it is addressed to 'them that dwell upon the earth, every nation and tribe and tongue and people.' It is called 'an eternal gospel,' which surely implies that it is a message of hope to those who can appreciate it and profit thereby. The mere fact that the writer speaks of such a message being sent to all peoples scarcely accords with the view that he regards the Empire as having sunk into such a state of hopelessness as to render further warning of no avail.

It has frequently been maintained that by his reference to the thunder-voices and the command to leave them unrecorded the writer is alluding to the absence from his Apocalypse of a set of visions, known to his readers, the omission of which would otherwise have perplexed them. 'The plain sense of the passage,' says Moffatt, *ad loc.*, 'is that the author wishes to justify his omission of a seven-thunder source or set of visions circulating in contemporary circles of prophecy. In view of the authoritative character of such fragments or traditions, John justifies his procedure by the explanation that he felt inspired to do so, and also to substitute other oracles.' This may well be right so far as it goes. The article in *αἱ ἐν τῷ βρονταί* certainly implies that the thunders were not unknown to the readers. But if the readers were acquainted with the set of visions omitted, there would not be much point in an attempt to explain their omission unless that omission carried with it some special significance. Merely to say that the writer is justifying his omission of them is but a partial interpretation. We are bound to ask why he is commanded to leave them out. Can it be that he is ordered to leave the thunder-voices unrecorded because the judgments of which they spoke were not going to happen in fact?

In his account of the first six Seals in chapter 6 the Seer makes use of the Little Apocalypse which has been woven into the texture of the Apocalyptic

Discourse to be found in the thirteenth chapter of Mark. The evidence on which this view is based is given by Charles on pp. 158, 159 of his first volume. It is of interest to note that every one of the Seer's parallels with the Marcan Discourse is with a part of it that criticism attributes to the Little Apocalypse, a fact which may, perhaps, be regarded as confirming the conclusions of criticism. Can it be that the passage which we are discussing in chapter 10 presents another parallel with the Little Apocalypse? In Mk 13²⁰ (=Mt 24²²), which critics with one accord assign to the Little Apocalypse, we read: 'And except the Lord had shortened the days, no flesh would have been saved: but for the elect's sake, whom he chose, he shortened the days.' This conception that God would for the sake of His elect shorten the days of tribulation and trial that were to prelude the coming of the Kingdom forms one of the stock ideas of Apocalyptic. There would be nothing strange in its inclusion in the great Christian Apocalypse; and where could it more fittingly be introduced than in this tenth chapter—just before the final Woe? This, we think, is the thought which the original readers of the Apocalypse would discern in the command that came to the Seer to leave the thunder-voices unrecorded. It is significant that there follows *immediately* the declaration of the strong angel that there would be no more delay. The uttering of this solemn oath is the main function of the strong angel in this chapter, the part he plays in the matter of the little book being altogether secondary. The signs of rivalry between the thunder-voices and the utterances of the angel, to which attention has already been called, confirm the correctness of our interpretation of the command to leave the former unrecorded. The judgments of which the thunders tell had their place at first in the Divine plan, and so they strive, as it were, to be heard and recorded. A voice from high heaven, however, proclaims that they are to be left unrecorded. It is the voice of God Himself. The Philoxenian Syriac—as if to remove all possible uncertainty on this point—says the voice came from the seventh heaven. God is cancelling a series of judgments. He is shortening the days for the sake of His elect.

Attention has often been drawn to the strange form of the command that came from heaven. How could things unwritten be sealed up? The command has also frequently been compared with

the injunction addressed to Daniel: 'But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end' (Dn 12⁴). If our interpretation of the command that came to the Christian Seer be correct, it would seem to suggest that it owes its peculiar form to a desire to bring out the contrast between it and the injunction addressed to Daniel. Daniel is to seal up his words—but only for a time; the events depicted in them will one

day actually come to pass. The Christian Seer, too, is to seal up the utterances of the thunders—but in this case the sealing is not just for a season. The things uttered by the seven thunders are not to be written down at all! No record of them is needed, for they will never at any time come to pass. God is not merely postponing them, He is obliterating them! He is blotting them out of His plan!

Recent Foreign Theology.

The History of Religions.

IN the January number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES attention was called to the publication of the fourth and thoroughly revised edition of the *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte*,¹ founded by Dr. Chantepie de la Saussaye, who, in the Preface to the third edition, announced that his place would be taken by Professor Edvard Lehmann of Lund, one of his most distinguished collaborators. In 1910 this Swedish scholar was appointed Professor of the History of Religions and the Philosophy of Religion in the University of Berlin; he has written on the Religions of Primitive Peoples and on Buddhism, and contributed important articles to THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS (Primitive, Persian, and Parsi Religions). The co-editor of the *Lehrbuch* is Dr. A. Bertholet, Old Testament Professor in the University of Basle, and the author of many learned works, including commentaries on several Old Testament books.

Biblical religions are not included in the syllabus of this work, but there are occasional references both to Judaism and Christianity. For example, Lehmann (i. 120 f.) distinguishes between religions of external and internal redemption, instancing Paul and Luther as the classical exponents of the former. External redemption is held to be a familiar conception, not only in the Jewish prophets and in Christianity, but also in later Judaism and in

Hellenistic sects. The typical example of what is called internal redemption is Brahmanism, which teaches that salvation does not depend on the grace of God or any external gift, but on ascetic practices, self-improvement being achieved by renunciation and self-mastery. This extension of the connotation of the term 'redemption' has obvious disadvantages; it leads to the assertion, though with qualifications, that 'Buddha may be called a redeemer in so far as by his example he showed the way of salvation.' More helpful is the statement that Christian Mysticism affords evidence 'how easily external and internal redemption may blend, the inner self appropriating and using the external gifts of grace.'

The plan adopted by the editors is not to complete the first volume and then to issue the parts of the second volume, but alternately to publish the parts of the two volumes. But all the articles for which the editor-in-chief is responsible are found in the parts that have already appeared. The first volume contains two introductory articles which are of special interest, and in the second volume is his historical sketch of the Persian religion.

The object of the first article is to show that the History of Religions has a history of its own ('Zur Geschichte der Religionsgeschichte'); it begins, however, by pointing out that the History of Religions is really as old as History itself. For example, Herodotus gave as much attention to the religious ideas and customs of strange peoples as to their political life. Regret is expressed that works which make the History of Religions their special theme have been lost, notably the eighth

¹ *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte*, begründet von Chantepie de la Saussaye. Vierte, vollständig neu bearbeitete Auflage. In zwei Bänden. 4 Swiss francs each part. Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen.

book of the *Φιλippiκά* of Theopompus. There is a rich storehouse of information in this admirable survey which is much more than a Bibliography. As remarkable for their comprehensiveness as for their terseness are the lucid summaries and shrewd estimates of the contributions made by ancient and modern writers on the various religions of the world. The problem which in divers ways they help us to solve is the determination of the extent of 'the influence of the worship, the philosophy, and the personal religion of the ancients on the shaping of early Christianity.'

Dr. Lehmann's second article, entitled 'Religious Phenomena and Ideas' (i. 23-130), is divided into ten sections with such topical headings as 'Nature and Spirits,' 'Deities and Divinity,' 'Worship,' 'Piety.' From many angles each subject is surveyed, the author's aim being to show what conceptions of the *summum bonum* have been held by the various races in successive ages, for 'instead of relegating religion to the realm of the illusory, we ought rather to raise the question as to whether it is not the expression and embodiment of the profoundest human need.' Because religion is a great educator of the human race we may learn from the History of Religions more quickly than from profane history what is essential to the well-being of the race and of the individual.

A most instructive discussion of the relations between Mythology and Theology leads to the conclusion that 'it is a sign of the decay of the higher religions when the mythical element in their faith and doctrine comes to the surface again.' The natural affinity of mythology is with polytheism: 'the endless genealogies of which complaint is made in 1 Tim i. 4 are the offshoots of polytheistic heathenism, for a homogeneous conception of the Divine on which a real theology may be built is impossible to Polytheism; it can but indicate where monistic tendencies appear, as in the Avesta, in the latest phases of Egyptian and Greek paganism, and in the Puranas of Hinduism. . . . It was the faith in God of the Jews and of the Christians that first created a genuine theology.' In this connexion it is pointed out that whilst Babylonians, Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans had scriptures in abundance, none of them had a single Scripture giving comprehensive and exhaustive expression to their faith. 'It is not the system but the religion that makes the Bible,'

and only when the religion has a universal value has the book a universal significance. Each of the three world-religions has its Holy Scripture, namely, Buddhism, Christianity, and Islam, 'but the New Testament is the purest religious creation of these sacred writings; throughout it is permeated by religious ideals to which its historical, ethical, and liturgical elements are alike subservient.'

The extensive range of Lehmann's article on 'The Persians' (ii. 199-279) may be indicated by giving the titles of its twelve chapters: the Medo-Persian people, the Locale and the Founder of the Religion, Religious Literature, the Iranic Religion before Zarathustra, a general survey of the Zarthustrian Religion is followed by sections on the Doctrine of God in the Gathas, the Pantheism of the later Avesta, the realm of evil, Worship, Purifications and Customs, the last things, Parsism from Alexander to the present day, and Manichæism.

The Bibliography includes a reference to the relevant articles 'by various Iranists' in THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS, and to the works of Darmesteter, J. H. Moulton, L. H. Mills, E. West, etc. Parsism to-day is said to be 'a survival, insignificant in Persia, but somewhat more vigorous in India,' where 90,000 out of the 100,000 Parsis live. 'The prosperity and respect which they enjoy is, to a large extent, due to the principles of their Zoroastrian faith, which inculcate the ancient virtues of honesty and sincerity.' Fire-worship and many of the old customs are retained, as, for example, the exposure of dead bodies to the vultures; on the other hand, 'their theology, influenced by its modern environment and revised, has become an ethical monotheism' which, however, their scholars claim to find in the Avesta.

Quotations from the Pehlevi writings are given to show that they are a distinct advance upon the rigid and formal Ethics of the Avesta. Though they are not free from Dualism, there is a spiritualizing of the virtues and a deeper understanding of the principles of morality. Purity is not, as in the Avesta, the highest good, but 'to be thankful to all, and to desire the good of all.' The laudation of riches gives place to a recognition of the fact that they do not always bring happiness: 'The poor man who is content is rich, but the rich man who is discontented is poor.' Again it is written, 'to live without fear is the true riches.'

In recent years great advance has been made in specialized study of the History of Religions; students will find that this invaluable *Lehrbuch* gives the results of scholarly research during the last decade as well as a judicial estimate of

earlier contributions to the subject. High appreciation of the new is combined with due valuing of the old.

J. G. TASKER.

Leamington Spa.

Contributions and Comments.

The People's Coming Question: A Note.

MR. H. G. WELLS in his *Outline of History* states in a sentence not only perhaps the most real problem of to-day, but what popular opinion may very easily fasten on as crucial, when he says: 'What will be clear to any one who reads the Epistles side by side with the Gospels is that his (Paul's) mind was saturated by an idea that does not appear prominently in the reported sayings and teachings of Jesus—the idea of a sacrificial person who is offered up to God as an atonement for sin. What Jesus preached was a new birth of a human soul; what Paul preached was the ancient religion of priest and altar and propitiatory bloodshed.' Mr. Wells may be making the popular mistake of thinking the loose and misleading phraseology and ideas of revival hymns and Anglo-Catholic sermons are Pauline, or for that matter Scriptural; and, if he is, we have only ourselves to blame. In speaking of priest and altar he must have, moreover, in his mind the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is not Pauline, and even there forgets that the aim of the Epistle is to use familiar and significant ideas merely as stepping-stones to the personal relationship which does away with intermediary forms. At the same time, when we have elucidated meanings and cleared away popular misunderstandings, there remains the solid fact of the change of atmosphere when one passes from the Synoptic Gospels to the Epistles, the change of emphasis, and in some ways the actual change of substance. Things are made central and essential in relationship which are at most only touched on by Jesus. It is idle to pretend otherwise, and the man next door is beginning to ask about it. Some honest hard thinking will be required, but

the contributions of scholars who are not themselves apprehended of Christ are really worthless, except as preliminary inquiry, in a question which is of all questions essentially a religious and experimental one. But apart from what New Testament scholars who are also religious men will have to say—and we shall be increasingly asking guidance from them—there are one or two elementary facts to be kept in mind.

The Evangelical faith appears as soon as anything appears in the history of Christianity. After the Resurrection there is in Scripture no record of any other which is supplanted. This Christian faith of the New Testament is moving in the communities well within the lifetime of the friends and disciples of Jesus, and it is their faith too. It is universal and, so far as documents go, it is primitive in Christianity. No more to us than to them is the place given to Christ incongruous with Himself in the Gospels. It would be incongruous with what we know of Socrates or Mahomet, or Livingstone or Florence Nightingale, or Paul or Bernard of Clairvaux, or Francis Xavier or William Carey, or John Wesley or Alexander Whyte; or any reader's father or brother or mother; or any character in fact or fiction known to us. We may have great argument about the text, or over what He did or did not say, or claim to be. I am not entering into these problems, but into the one raised: the relation of the Jesus of the Gospels as our Bibles show Him—sinless, forgiving sins, full of grace and truth—to the Jesus of His interpreters after He was gone—as our Bibles show them—which is what Mr. Wells and the public are concerned with. There they are, Gospels and Epistles, all growing up in the same household entirely unaware of any breach one between the other. In those circumstances, to believe that the influence of pagan religions, which had been pegging

away rather futilely amid their cliques and clans for generations, had any radical or revolutionary influence on the Christianity of the New Testament writers is very difficult. In so far as there were elements of the common instincts of humanity in them and any desire for goodness and union with God to that end, there were points of contact that any competent missionary, then as now, would have to reckon with and use.

The Christian faith is the result of the impression made by the whole personality of Jesus. That was not and could not be known or realized till after His crucifixion and resurrection. Nor, therefore, could an adequate sense of the meaning of forgiveness exist until what was involved for Jesus in bringing forgiveness was made clear by the unrelenting march of events. Jesus Himself could not reveal all, for no one can make use of an historical fact when it does not yet exist as a fact. If forgiveness comes with the simplicity of answer to a need in the Gospels, it was an answer that only Jesus could supply, and now, though they could not then, we know the price He paid and what it cost Him to supply it. There seems, therefore, no change in the principle of God's forgiveness; it is given to him who sincerely and really desires it now, as when Jesus was alive on earth. But the further apprehension of truth demands a deeper quality of response in us; if at all events the sinful hardness of man's treatment of God as, in the solid framework of history, He spoke and offered forgiveness in Jesus is appreciated as it ought to be, then 'just asking' involves a good deal. It involves shame, for one thing. And it involves a profound sense of indebtedness, for another. And, not least, humble thanksgiving that the God we have to do with is the God and Father of Jesus Christ. It is evidently not so easy to 'preach the new birth of a human soul' or to bring that soul to birth; and yet God thinks it worth while to have it done. It has, in history, meant sacrifice and bloodshed to bring the message of reconciliation to man, so as to accomplish in each forgiven soul another creative act within the moral order of the world. Only so, not in theory, but in substantial fact, do we receive 'that pardon which recognizes sin and, in spite of it, restores fellowship.' 'In the Cross of One Who did no sin and deserved none of its evil consequences, love makes its highest claim to trust and its largest demand for loyalty. For that reason it is the inmost

sanctuary of pardon and reconciliation, where we can take up our discipline and duty, assured of finding them the way of victory, because we have learned the mind of Him who appoints them, and would ourselves also be partakers in the sacrifice and service by which sin and all its consequences must be overcome.'¹

At all events, according to our Gospels, Jesus felt so Himself. This is not a question of this saying or that, but the message of Gethsemane, of the Upper Room, of Calvary. Jesus throughout this period is either incomparably greater than any other and engaged in an incomparably nobler task, or somewhat less than some. He is either—if merely facing death—lacking in qualities of calm and silent courage (which I personally have seen in a deserter sentenced to be shot, and are to be found in many a quite unknown man or woman), or He is shouldering a burden all His own. His bearing, in short, is only explicable, in consistency with His character elsewhere, with just that tremendous fact of personal and final relationship to the world's sin and sorrow and to God, which Christian faith has from the beginning placed there.

INNES LOGAN.

Cambridge.

Rendering of Amos v. 25, 26.

MAY I offer a suggestion on the rendering of וְשִׂחָתָם? Might it not be taken as carrying on the question in v.²⁵?

1. The A.V. and R.V., following the LXX, construe it as a perfect with simple י. Amos is thus represented as accusing Israel of a lapse into idolatry in the desert, evidently into a form of Assyrian star-worship. Such a contention, however, is out of harmony with the prophet's purpose, which is to convince Israel that they have proved faithless to Yahweh, and were indulging in a sacrificial ritual which He had not enjoined in the wilderness. Like Jeremiah (cf. Jer 2^a), this prophet of Tekoa regarded the time of sojourn in the desert as a specially favoured and happy period in their history (2^{9.10}). Many critics therefore conclude that v.²⁶ has been added at a much later time and intrudes on the argument of Amos.

2. The alternative rendering in the R.V. margin

¹ Oman, *Grace and Personality*, 220 (Camb. Univ. Press, 2nd ed., 1919).

treats וַיִּשְׁאָחַם as a perfect with ו consecutive. The announcement of punishment begins at this point, 'And you will lift up your images . . . and I will cause you to go into exile.' A graphic picture of exiles, laden with their impotent images and driven into banishment, is presented to us. The difficulty here is that Amos appears to have suddenly changed his ground. He has just challenged false ritual, but in v.²⁶ we discover that idolatry is the cause of God's wrath and punishment.

3. I think the difficulty might be got over, partially at least, by taking וַיִּשְׁאָחַם in the R.V., but reading it as a question and not as a statement. V.²⁶ carries on the thought of v.²⁵. Amos still contrasts Israel's sinful present with its happy past. The objection may be raised that we should expect ה to be followed by אַם in such interrogative sentences. But the Hebrew usage is not always the same (*vide* Ges. Kautzsch, § 150 h), and the inflection of the speaker's voice would determine whether a question were asked or not.

Linking up vv.²⁵⁻²⁶ in this way, we get a double challenge from Amos—a challenge of a hollow ceremonialism divorced from ethics, and a challenge on the ground of idolatrous practices. The prophet demands indignantly, 'Was it sacrifices and cereal-offerings ye brought me in the desert forty years, O House of Israel; and did ye bear Sakkuth, your king, and Kaiwan, your star-god . . .? So will I carry you away into exile,' etc.

Amos charges Northern Israel with having fallen away from the pure worship of the desert. Then no sacrifices were necessary, and, further, what they bore was the ark of their Covenant-God. It has been urged that otherwise star-worship is not heard of in the times of Amos. There is no doubt, however, that the corruptions of idolatry were at work, and there is no particular reason to deny the forms of astral cult mentioned here. The influence of Babylonia was far-reaching (see *Local Colour of the Bible*, vol. ii. p. 77 f.).

H. A. WILLIAMSON.

Lochee.

Entre Nous.

The Succour of the Sacrament.

There is a curious dearth of good sermons for special occasions. Recognizing this, Messrs. James Clarke set themselves to supply the need, publishing last year a volume of 'Harvest Thanksgiving Sermons' by representative preachers, and now this month issuing a companion volume of *Communion Addresses* (5s. net). The sermons in the present volume are by the Rev. Arch. Alexander, B.D., the Rev. James Black, D.D., the Rev. J. Golder Burns, B.D., the Rev. J. T. Forbes, D.D., the Rev. R. C. Gillie, D.C.L., Principal H. Maldwyn Hughes, D.D., the Rev. Norman Maclean, D.D., the Rev. G. H. Morrison, D.D., the Rev. James Reid, M.A., Prof. J. A. Robertson, D.D., the Rev. Hubert L. Simpson, M.A., and the Rev. Lauchlan MacLean Watt, D.D.

Dr. Gillie weaves his thoughts round the phrase in 1 Co 10¹⁶, 'the cup of blessing'—the cup of God's benevolence.

'His whole personality, perfected in obedience, complete in sacrifice, is available for each of us.

We are not mere beholders, we are partakers. "Eat," "Drink thereof," are the words in our ears. . . . Therefore when the bread and the wine enter into our bodies this is the plain and unmistakable assurance that He, His personality, His life, are available for us.' The Sacrament tells us clearly Christ's present availableness.

And the Sacrament is also perfectly adapted to the need of our human nature. 'Two things we suffer from in all our inward life, monotony and vagueness. . . . This sacrament deals effectually with these two disabilities. It removes monotony by giving focal points of spiritual experiences, mountain peaks on the journey, a little troublesome to climb but vastly rewarding.

'The further proof of adaptation to human need is this. Most of us are greatly helped by outward acts to make inward facts more real. We need the lifebelt if we are to swim easily in the rough water. Symbols are the lifebelt. The marriage ring does not make marriage more of a fact. . . . But the

marriage ring helps every wife to know the reality of the married life and the holiness of her vow. . . . The Sacrament of Communion is the marriage ring of the union of the soul with God in Christ.'

A Preposterous Assertion.

Jésus dans l'Histoire et dans le Mystère, by M. L. de Grandmaison (Bloud & Gay, Paris; 3.50 fr.), is a reply of some seventy pages to a series of articles in the 'Mercure de France' by Dr. Couchoud, which the good father appears to think ought to be answered. It seems rather a waste of time. For Dr. Couchoud, if he is here accurately photographed, appears to be a rough bludgeoning kind of a person with no delicacy of touch, and small power of convincing. Briefly, his argument, we are told, is that there never was an historical Jesus, that all we have is a kind of Mystery Religion myth. There was a hope floating about in the air of a great Someone who was coming; and Paul, in his mystical poetic way, saw the dream that he too shared actually embodied for a moment that hot day on the dusty road to Damascus. And that was how it all began! Mark heard of it, it seems, and (surely rather cleverly!) concocted a Figure, all spun out of prophecy and imagination and hope and day-dreaming and apocalypse, with not a shadow of historical foundation; and then the others followed him. Somebody thought out the Prodigal. Who? Oh! just any one. They were all doing that kind of thing quite easily, it seems. And some one else made up the Sermon on the Mount, and it got added too. So the thing grew. There was an infuriated colonel who bade a young officer remember that courage is a virtue, but foolish recklessness a crime. It seems a pity Dr. Couchoud was not there to hear. What can you make of a man who declares boldly that there is no allusion in Paul to an historical personage called Jesus; no, nor, apart from the Gospels, in the whole New Testament, with one exception? One likes that carefulness. It gives a fine air of verisimilitude to a preposterous assertion. Père de Grandmaison is very patient and courteous. But is it worth while?

Reading the Newspaper.

'Have you ever considered what a call to prayer is the morning or evening newspaper? It seems to me that every column, almost every paragraph, cries to us to side with and work with the will of God in some particular matter. In home politics, in

foreign politics, in Church and State, problems are being faced day by day which need an immense force of prayer behind them if they are to be wisely dealt with. Every morning in our newspaper we read of the sufferings or the sins or the perplexities or the happiness of many persons. Do you remember when some years ago a wretched man named Armstrong was being tried for the murder of his wife? Day after day, week after week, we followed the sordid story in our newspaper. How many of us, I wonder, ever thought of praying to God to grant to that wretched man repentance and confession of sin?'

This quotation is from *The Life of Prayer in the World*, by the Rev. Francis Underhill, M.A., a second impression of which has just been issued by Messrs. Mowbray (1s. 6d.), and it suggests a very different attitude from the one prevalent to-day, where the sordid is read eagerly because it is sordid, and papers are induced to print more and more of it to please their readers, so that at length it becomes necessary to introduce a Bill to prevent the printing of salacious matter.

Very simply and very directly Mr. Underhill deals with the life of prayer, dividing his subject into six chapters. They are the Interior Life, Distraction and Concentration in Prayer, Intercession, Meditation, Examination of Conscience, and Rules for the Life of Prayer in the World.

Distraction in Prayer.

'How is it possible for a person whose habits of thought are careless, selfish, unkind, impure, angry, self-centred, to be able at a set time to concentrate and restrain his thoughts in such a way as to be able to dwell upon God, to listen and speak to Him?'

'How can a person who never thinks of God, or hardly thinks of Him, all day and all night long, expect to kneel down at 7 o'clock in the morning and 11 o'clock at night, and say good, concentrated prayers? No, if prayer is to be anything, it must be everything—not an occasional act, but the background and the atmosphere of life.'

¹ F. Underhill, *The Life of Prayer in the World*, 18.